MINUTES

LIBRARY OF
THE WOMAN'S COLLEGE OF
THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
GREENSBORO, N. C.

THIRD ANNUAL CONVENTION

OF THE

ASSOCIATION OF HISTORY TEACHERS OF THE MIDDLE STATES AND MARYLAND

Held at

New York University

March 10 and 11, 1905

PRICE, 25 CENTS

063
163 P

MINUTES

Third Annual Convention

of the

Association of History Teachers

of the

MIDDLE STATES AND MARYLAND

Held at

New York University

March 10 and 11, 1905

Price 25 cents

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Officers and Councils	1
Announcements	3
Address of Welcome, Chancellor H. M. MacCracken, New York University	6
The High-School Curriculum in History—Papers and Discussions	7
The Early Cartography of the New World and Its Value to the Student of the Period, Professor E. L. Stevenson	36
The Character and Limitations of Geographical Control, Professor Albert P. Brigham	43
History Teaching in the Elementary Schools—Papers and Discussions	55
Business Meeting	84
List of Members	86

OFFICERS AND COUNCIL, 1904—5.

President
J. H. VAN SICKLE
BALTIMORE.

Vice-President
M. S. BROWN
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

Secretary-Treasurer
E. H. CASTLE
TEACHERS COLLEGE, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

LUCY M. SALMON
VASSAR COLLEGE

C. H. HULL
CORNELL UNIVERSITY

C. A. HERRICK
CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL, PHILA.

C. J. GEER
SHADY SIDE ACADEMY

P. O. ROBINSON
HIGH SCHOOL OF COMMERCE
NEW YORK CITY

OFFICERS AND COUNCIL, 1905–6

President
C. M. ANDREWS
Bryn Mawr College

Vice-President
EMMA G. SEBRING
St. Agatha School

Secretary-Treasurer
E. H. CASTLE
Teachers College, Columbia University

J. H. VAN SICKLE
Baltimore

J. M. VINCENT
Johns Hopkins University

EDWARD RYNEARSON
Pittsburg

SARAH A. DYNES
State Normal School, Trenton

PAUL VAN DYKE
Princeton University

ANNOUNCEMENTS

THE NEXT CONVENTION

THE next annual convention will be held at the State Normal School, Trenton, New Jersey, on March 9 and 10, 1906. One session will be devoted to a discussion of two topics in history to illustrate the ideas which underlie the work of our two committees. A second session will be given over to a discussion of the teacher's preparation for teaching, especially in our normal schools. The evening session will consist of a subscription dinner and an address by some historian. More detailed announcements will be sent members in February.

ANNUAL DUES

The annual fee is one dollar and becomes due at the beginning of the fiscal year, which is the second Friday in March. Those who join before January 1, 1906, will receive both the minutes of our own association and also of the New England association. The latter will contain an article by Professor Emerton, Harvard University, on the teaching of medieval history.

LOCAL CONFERENCES

At its last convention the association voted unanimously to authorize the formation of local conferences of history teachers.

The primary purposes of such conferences is the same as that of the association—"to advance the study and teaching of history and government through discussion" and "to promote personal acquaintance among teachers and students of history." It is expected in this way to reach a large number of teachers whose work and location prevent them from attending conven-

tions frequently and to enlist their active interest and support. The stimulus of the convention may thus in a measure be brought to members at a distance from the center of the association.

Such local conferences will also afford opportunities for wider discussion than is possible at the convention. Free discussion of opinion will indicate the lines of work of greatest interest and worth. In this way the local conference will materially supplement the work of the association and the two will be mutually helpful.

The local conference is to be controlled and directed entirely by the members of the conference. To get the conference started a chairman has been appointed for each local center. He will associate with himself other members and will secure the widest and most hearty coöperation of all persons interested in history in the locality. The secretary will forward to each chairman a list of all members of the association in his vicinity.

The members of the conference should become members of the association. Those who join before January 1, 1906, will receive the minutes of the March meeting and also whatever exchanges we are able to make with other associations. The minutes of the New England association will contain a paper by Professor Emerton, Harvard University, on the teaching of medieval history; the minutes of the North Central association will contain papers and discussions upon two themes—"What Can the College Expect from the High School?" and "Should Civics and United States History be Taught Together or Separately in the High School?"—as also reports of committees upon illustrative material and parallel reading. Our own minutes will contain a full report of the papers and discussions of the last convention.

The following suggestions are offered as a result of experience in the formation of local conferences in other associations. The expenses should be confined to postage and printing, and the machinery of organization be as little as possible. If five or more members will guarantee two or three dollars apiece toward these expenses (to be repaid out of the local dues established at the conference), the membership may be made large at the start. If the total membership of the association can be raised to five hundred through the local conferences (a thing

which seems easily possible, judging from the estimates of those who asked for such conferences and from the experience of other associations), the association will be asked at the Trenton meeting to authorize the payment of postage and printing for the local centers in the future.

If the chairmen of adjacent centers will confer with one another before arranging a time for the conference, it may be possible to secure a speaker from a distance by holding conferences on successive days. The secretary is directed to give what aid he can toward securing such speakers.

The program for the conference will be made out entirely by the committee in charge. One center will probably take up a study of the historical material in its vicinity; another will give the greater portion of its time to discussion of the papers presented at the convention; a third will take up some work calculated to arouse the community to an appreciation of the part that history should play in the educational system, etc. Probably it will be wisest to attempt but one conference before the meeting at Trenton, and that in the fall. A speaker from outside the vicinity will doubtless be an attraction. Brief reports of the conference should be sent to the secretary soon after the conference, to be printed in the minutes, if possible, and to guide the council in planning a program for the following year. A portion of the program of next year will be devoted to reports from the conferences, if the plan works out well.

It is suggested that local conferences be established at the following places. Those whose names are put after the places will act as chairmen. Members who live outside these places should send their names to the chairman of the conference which they wish to join. Other conferences will be established as demand arises for them.

New York and Vicinity—Doctor William Fairley, Commercial High School, Brooklyn, N. Y.

Baltimore—Professor R. H. Wright, City College.

Binghamton—Superintendent G. R. Miller, Department of Education.

Bridgeton—Principal Phoebus Lyon, West Jersey Academy.

Philadelphia—Professor C. A. Herrick, Central High School.

Pittsburg—Professor C. J. Geer, Shady Side Academy.

Poughkeepsie—Miss Lucy M. Salmon.
Syracuse—Professor W. H. Mace, University of Syracuse.
Trenton—Superintendent Ebenezer Mackey, Department of Education.
Washington—Director Percy M. Hughes, Central High School.

ADDRESS OF WELCOME

H. M. MAC CRACKEN

CHANCELLOR NEW YORK UNIVERSITY

Chancellor MacCracken welcomed the members of the association to New York university at the opening of the Friday afternoon session, saying in part:

New York University gives to-day the freedom of her premises to the History Teachers of the Middle States and Maryland. You are meeting on what is now the most ancient college ground in New York city. No other land in the city has been occupied for university purposes for almost three-quarters of a century. It is, therefore, historic ground. For the time being we affiliate two outside faculties with us under this roof; one of which makes books and the other "Success." But the time will come when we may use the entire twelve stories for education, for our schools of law and pedagogy, for graduate work and commerce, for museums and meetings of learned societies, several of which make their headquarters here to-day. It is as near as possible to the center of population of the greater New York, with more people living within sixty minutes' ride than there are in all Scotland or all Ireland. You are welcome also to our other two university centers. If you cannot visit University Heights, you can see it in miniature in the remarkable model placed in the lobby. You may study there the Hall of Fame and may note this interesting fact. A man does not injure his chances for fame by writing history, if only he does not write too much. Washington Irving wrote Knickerbocker's New York. Hawthorne wrote the life of Franklin Pierce. Longfellow wrote the life of Evangeline and of Hiawatha. Audubon called his greatest work Ornithological Biographies. Jonathan Edwards wrote a history of revivals. Benjamin Franklin, John Adams and General Grant wrote autobiographies more or less complete. John Marshall wrote the life of Washington; Thomas Jefferson,

an account of Virginia. By stretching a point we set down a third of these famous men of America as teachers of history, as well as makers of history. I call your attention to the fact that the two historians, Motley and Prescott, were strongly supported for the Hall of Fame five years ago, one being supported by forty-four electors, and the other by thirty-three. It is not impossible that one or the other of them may win a tablet the present year.

I began a library nearly five and fifty years ago, when I was in my tenth year. The first book placed there has stamped upon the leather binding, the Latin word, "Initium," because it was the beginning of my books. It is an octavo volume of Macaulay's England, the first two volumes. It was printed in Cincinnati in 1849 and given me by my father as a birthday present when I was ten years old. I count that book one of the chief influences of my life.

Abraham Lincoln is reported to have said to one of his sons: "You will know a great deal more than your father, but you will never have as good a time." He might as truly have said: "You will know a great many more classified facts than your father, but you will never know them as intensely as he knows a few facts, and you will never draw from them laws and principles that will burn into the intellects and consciences of mankind." Therefore, if I may give a single maxim to you history teachers, it is this: Teach at least a few facts intensively and help your students to have a few intense conclusions in the way of principles for the conduct of life.

At the close of this address, Present Van Sickle made a brief response in behalf of the association, and the convention at once proceeded with the reports of its committees.

THE GENERAL SCHEME FOR A HIGH SCHOOL CURRICULUM IN HISTORY

JAMES HARVEY ROBINSON

PROFESSOR OF HISTORY, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

[To present the following report without a few words of explanation would manifestly be misleading to readers and unfair to the committee.

Two committees were appointed in 1903 to report at the

Philadelphia meeting, the one upon certain matters pertaining to entrance examinations, the other upon the better articulation of the work in the secondary schools and colleges. Independently each committee concluded that any remedially effective solution of the present difficulties involved a study of the larger problems of the entire history curriculum from grammar school to college; further, that any satisfactory arrangement must be sought through a general agreement as to content and method suitable to grammar school, secondary school, and college and a careful differentiation of the work in each rather than through any arbitrary agreement as to number of periods per week, number of points required for entrance to college, etc. Therefore the reports printed in the minutes of last year were chiefly devoted to a statement of the conditions which materially affect the work in history in secondary school, and college. A sequence of subjects was suggested for a four years' course in history in the secondary schools, based upon a change in content and the omission of much material now used, the selection of material with a view to explaining to the pupils modern life and history as a study of human life, and a moderate application of the principle of intensive study to all years of the curriculum, etc.

The reports that follow present those points which the committee thinks of value for discussion by the members of the association. When the entire subject has been discussed before the association the committee will present its final recommendations for adoption. It is believed that a more satisfactory solution may be reached if the members of the Association follow the work of the committee and participate in the work. One session of next year's program will be devoted so the possible treatment of two topics to show how the ideas of the committee would be worked out in practice.—SECRETARY.]

The efforts of the Committee of Ten of the National Educational Association and of the Committee of Seven of the American Historical Association were directed chiefly toward securing for history a firm foothold in our high schools, and preparatory schools. The success of these committees has been well nigh marvelous if the conditions which prevailed thirteen years ago, when the Committee of Ten met at Madison, be considered. Now that history has come into its rightful heritage and is ac-

corded more and more generally three or four years in the high school course, the problem presents itself: How may the work be best arranged to meet the needs of the student? What fields shall be covered, what shall be the order of their presentation, and what relation shall they bear to one another? There is in historical work an almost indefinite range of possible selection and adjustment. History is a broad term and a very vague one. Many a wonderful page in the great book of the past has been neglected by some unfortunate oversight, while many a stupid, unedifying or dubious one has been perversely copied and recopied.

This committee in reconsidering the possibilities of a four-year course found no reason to call in question the natural and usual plan of beginning historical study in the high school with ancient history. It heartily agrees, however, that, in view of the long period to be considered and of the remoteness of many of the constitutional and military matters from the natural interests of the students, a mass of detail commonly included in the course should be elided in order to make place for a satisfactory discussion of the great debt in art and literature which we owe to Egypt, Greece and Rome. Conditions and achievements, rather than constitutional or political history, should be emphasized. Perhaps the best point for closing the history of the Roman work is the reign of Justinian. Important factors in the general situation of Europe can be conveniently associated with his name, and in breaking the thread of the narrative at this point there is little danger of giving any misleading notions of an abrupt transition from the ancient to the medieval period.

It is far, however, from the committee's intention to suggest that the work in ancient history be in any way made heavier or more exacting than at present; on the contrary, it hopes that the work may be lightened by confining the student's attention to the great salient facts in the civilization of Greece and Rome. Indeed, this committee ventures to think that some high schools may find it possible to give a very useful review of ancient civilization in half a year and may prefer to use the time thus saved for a course in civil government or in the elements of political economy—a subject for which there appears to be a natural and growing demand.

The attempt to combine, as is generally done, medieval and modern history in one comprehensive course reaching from the barbarian invasions or Charlemagne's time to the opening of the twentieth century the committee regards as inexpedient. No such course can be expected to give the student any firm grasp of present conditions as the outcome of historical antecedents. If we are talking at the beginning of the year of the interview between Pope Leo the Great and Attila we can hardly be expected to have made quite clear at the end of the year the conditions which led up to the recent interview at Port Arthur between Nogi and Stoessel. In order to meet this difficulty it seems advisable to divide the general course in European history into two parts. The committee recommends that one year be devoted to the changes from the break-up of the Roman Empire to the Treaty of Utrecht and the close of the reign of Louis XIV. Many important matters can in this way be dealt with more fully than hitherto, and there will be time for a satisfactory interweaving of English history with that of the continent.

By devoting a year to the history of the last century and a half or two centuries the past may be shown to abut squarely upon the present. An understanding of our world of today and its problems is, after all, the consummation of all historical study, and a wise recognition of this truth would soon serve to vivify our historical instruction from beginning to end. Little need be said of the early eighteenth century except of the appearance of Russia and Prussia in European affairs and of the opening of the great struggle between England and France over the supremacy in America and India. The fundamental reforms which began with the meeting of the Estates General in France should be carefully studied, since they furnish the key to the development of the nineteenth century. The democratic revolution, the advent of constitutional government, the industrial changes, the progress of transportation, the vast colonial and commercial enterprises of to-day—all these must find a place alongside the political history.

Should, as this committee recommends, the remaining year in the high school be devoted to American history, two questions immediately arise. First: Is there to be no course in English history? and second: Where is the study of civil government, so

closely associated with history, to find a place unless ancient history be confined to a half year only? So far as England is concerned the committee believes that, with the expansion of the general course in European history over two years, it will be quite possible to show clearly the chief peculiarities of English development and the particular contributions which England has made to the progress of western Europe in general. By this plan there will be no danger of losing sight of England's dependence on and close connection with the continent. Indeed, during the second year devoted to European history, England will quite naturally be made as prominent as France or Germany.

Some teachers, however, on account of the obvious continuity of English history its especially intimate interest for us and the range and variety of illustrative material readily available in our own tongue, will prefer to make England's development the basis of the work, at least in dealing with the last three or four centuries of modern history. It is to be hoped that our text-books may soon be so adjusted as to render this plan a feasible one for those who prefer it and yet are anxious to do justice to the history of the continent.

As for civil government the committee feels that this subject, when treated systematically as a branch of public law, frequently fails to enlist the interest of the high-school student. It would recommend, therefore, that whether time be found for a separate course in the subject or not, the principles of government be inculcated and illustrated by the later European and American history, thus giving the subject a concrete historical bearing. The first French constitution, the English reform bills, the German federation and the present French constitution could all be used to emphasize and reënforce the exigencies of political organization as illustrated first and foremost by the development of our own system.

In dealing with the American history two things should be kept in mind. The subject must be treated from a different point of view from that taken in the grammar school, so that there will be as little unnecessary repetition as possible. In the second place the industrial, social and commercial phases should be made prominent. The teachers should not satisfy themselves with the outline of political and military events. Our history

can be used to illustrate the principles not only of civil government but of political economy, especially if the student comes to the subject with the preparation which the earlier courses should furnish.

The details of the four years' work, the exact method of dealing with the several fields and of bringing them into close connection with one another, will demand careful attention and study.

With the growing necessity of making provision for students who wish to enter the high school in the middle of the school year, it may be essential to divide the work in history into courses occupying a half year each. In this case the program sketched out above would be as follows:

1.	semester.	ancient history.
2.	"	ancient history continued (or, medieval history to the opening of the fourteenth century).
3.	"	medieval history (or, Europe from the fifteenth to the eighteenth century).
4.	"	Europe from the fifteenth to the eighteenth century (or, modern history from the Treaty of Utrecht to the Congress of Vienna.)
5.	"	modern history from the Treaty of Utrecht to the Congress of Vienna* (or, Europe since 1815).
6.	"	Europe since 1815* (or, American history).
7.	"	American history (or, American history continued).
8.	"	American history continued (or, civil government or political economy).

ENGLISH HISTORY IN ITS RELATION TO THE GENERAL SCHEME

C. H. HULL

PROFESSOR OF HISTORY, CORNELL UNIVERSITY

Adequate evidence of that chastened spirit which Professor Robinson has imputed to your committee may be discovered, I I think, by comparing the recommendations which he has just presented on its behalf with the suggestions in the printed pro-

*England may be given the chief place during this period as indicated above.

gram. There are, you will admit, sufficient differences to prove that the committee is not too proud to learn. But those differences, so far at least as history is concerned, are, after all,less considerable than they may at first seem. They consist, in fact, of a shortening of the time allowed for ancient history and the assignment of a somewhat more prominent place in the description of the proposed course to the history of England. Just why the other members of the committee decided upon the latter change, I cannot say; but without assuming to speak for them, I may give two general reasons why the charge seems to me an improvement.

In the first place, English history is especially useful in the secondary schools because it is English. On that account alone it can be both better taught and more thoroughly learned than the history of any other European nation whatever, ancient or modern. For one thing its materials are chiefly in the vernacular. To the most necessary of them both teacher and pupil may have easy and unobstructed access, each according to his needs. No difficulties of language bar the way, and the most useful books are available in every considerable town. For another thing, the personalities, the events, and even the episodes of English history permeate English literature from Shakespeare to Tennyson. The pupil's curiosity about them is aroused before he enters upon historical study. Work in English history will support the work in English literature and will derive interest and support from it in turn. This no other work in European history can do. In the first place, then, a great advantage of English history lies in its mere Englishry.

In the second place English history is more closely connected with our own than is the history of continental Europe. This seems to me to be a major consideration. It is not the purpose of history teaching in the secondary schools to train investigators, but rather, on the one hand to help make citizens, and on the other, if possible, to give incipient men and women an interest which shall not center wholly in the shop or the nursery, or the theater. For those purposes that foreign history is best which the scholars can easiest read, both in school and afterward, and which, when read, will most directly come home to their business and bosoms. That English history possesses

these qualifications more completely than the history of the rest of Europe seems to be generally agreed. Half our own history is as truly English as it is American; and even since the Revolution the influences of language, institutions and laws, which divided Gaul, still connect the United States to England. It is no accident that the earliest, the most numerous, and the most important international arbitrations have been between Great Britain and the United States. Between them there was the necessary basis of common legal ideas and common notions of right. Each party could state its case in language which the other could understand. An arbitration between the United States and China is even now difficult to conceive. The minds of the arbitrators could not meet; they move in different orbits. But if any difference with great Britain arises, arbitration is, in fact, the first thought of intelligent men in both nations. That is no accident. There lies back of it a long and intimate connection of the countries, permitting a well-arranged course in the history of either to support, and to receive support from, the history of the other. It is to some of the possibilities of such mutual support in teaching the history of England and of America in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries that I invite your attention.

In their treatment of the period of discovery the more intelligent text-books of American history now recognize the importance of the European background. They even outline the European conditions which sent fishermen and gold-seekers and fur-traders and religious refugees to America. But as soon as the places where the various colonists settled have received their appropriate daubs of red and yellow and blue upon the map, the European background fades—what I may call the "European backing" of the colonists is forgotten. The important fact escapes attention that the colonists were long the objects of a European attention none the less solicitous and none the less important, because it was, at times, unintelligent.

Since the books pay, as a rule, no attention to European colonial policy, or even to that of England, they find it easy to ignore all the English colonies save the thirteen which revolted. And each of these, as soon as it is duly "established," they treat, except as to the intercolonial wars and perhaps as to profitless

boundary disputes, quite separately from each of the others. The whole period of American history that stretches from Cromwell to George III. loses all appearance of unity, on its civil side at least; and the American Revolution, as it draws near, perplexes the pupil almost as much as it did King George himself. The pupil knows, of course, that the Revolution took place, indeed, if he be a native American that is one of the things which he has "always known." He patriotically assumes that there must have been adequate reasons for it. But his study has scarcely revealed them. And if, by some miracle, he chances to reflect that the policies of trade and of taxation supposed to have provoked the Revolution in the thirteen continental colonies bore at least as hard upon a dozen others which did not revolt, his confusion of mind is increased. Thereupon we put him off with easy remarks about the "spirit of liberty," which, instead of being a real solution of the problem, are but a hazy formulation of it.

These and many like difficulties might be lessened by bringing American colonial history into closer connection with the history of England and by teaching it more largely from the view-point of colonial policy. The work of the third term, for example, in treating the history of England and of the continent, from 1300 to 1750, should make clear how the commercial policy of Cromwell differed from the dynastic policy of Elizabeth. Thus it can be understood how English colonies, founded by private enterprise, came to be controlled by the Navigation Act. The conquest of New Netherlands will be made intelligible as a part of British policy, and not less the earlier conquest of Jamaica. It will be seen how the need of controlling these conquered provinces precipitated a colonial problem upon an unwilling government at Westminster, much as an unexpected victory at Manila two hundred and fifty years later forced a similar problem upon an equally unprepared government at Washington.

The treatment of the Glorious Revolution of 1688 will still be constitutional, but it will be no longer exclusively constitutional. On the contrary, it will show also how the accession of William and Mary, supported by the commercial interest, brought England into a new relation of rivalry with France. Then the teacher of American history can put some meaning into the non-

military events of the "neglected period" from 1690 to 1750. He can show how England's new anxiety about her exposed colonies led to the Board of Trade in 1696 and to the repeated attempts to royalize the colonies or otherwise to subject them to a uniform control. He will be able to give an adequate account of the reasons which led to the founding of Georgia if he associates with the parliamentary grants for the establishment of that outpost of Englishry on the south the grants for the establishment of Halifax on the north. For him the stubborn contests of the provincial governors, backed by royal or proprietary instructions, with the representative assemblies backed by their constituents, contests over bills of credit in Massachusetts, contests over proprietors' taxes in Pennsylvania, contests over appropriations in New York, will acquire a new meaning. Reflecting how the struggles of Parliament against the Stuarts trained Pym and Hampden and Sidney and Russell, trained Puritans and Whigs for the English revolutions in England, he will see how, through the almost unknown disputes of a Delancey with a Clinton or an Adams with a Shute, Englishmen in America were prepared for the Revolution here. Not less truly than Edgehill and Marston Moor, Bunker Hill and Saratoga will appear to him to be battles of an English civil war.

On the purely American side of the Revolution, also, the study of our colonial history as the history of colonies should produce useful results. It should enable us to see how, by constant conflict with the representatives of the government in England, the representative machinery of each colonial democracy was bent to such a form and beaten to such a texture that with merely trifling changes, it could and did serve the purposes of a free and independent state. If we pause a moment to think of it, is there in all our history anything more noteworthy, anything better deserving to be understood, than the apparently sudden emergence, in the year 1776, of a group of state governments, fully organized, competent to the care of their own concerns, capable of serving as the type for the organization of our own Federal government, and as the prototype for every national government in America?

To be sure, we of the North have been so fearful, in the last fifty years, of encouraging secessionist notions, that our text-

books have slurred over the origin of the states, and have told us only of the origin of the union. Has not the time now come when we may safely recognize, as among the significant facts of our political history, the English origin and the continuous development of our state institutions?

All this, of course, should not be left wholly to the sixth and seventh terms. Events of American interest should be used, wherever possible, to illustrate the European and especially the English changes recounted in the third and fourth and fifth terms of the course. For example, the political generosity of the Restoration may be illustrated by the charters of Connecticut and Rhode Island, its desire for legal reform by the Commission to New England, its profuseness by the grants of New York, of the Carolinas and of the Hudson Bay territory to royal favorites. The panic fear of the French Revolution which produced Pitt's Traitorous Correspondence Act may be better appreciated if it is seen to be a cause of our own Alien and Sedition Laws as well. The sweep of Napoleon's continental system can be made clear by showing its effects upon Massachusetts and Virginia as well as upon Prussia and Portugal.

Do I fancy that you can teach these things to boys and girls in any such way as I have used? Most certainly I do not. But the way of teaching is your affair, not the committee's. Each of you must work out for himself his own method of presenting or of eliciting the facts and the conclusions. My purpose here is merely to suggest to you as teachers some problems that may prove worth your working upon.

No doubt while I have been speaking of the connection between English and American history ways have occurred to each of you whereby English history may also be used to illustrate, or may be illustrated by, the history of Europe. At least I hope so. But for a teacher whose work is confined, as mine is, to American history alone, it might be thought presumptious to trespass upon that field, and I forbear. May I be permitted, in closing, to make one further suggestion? The committee has exercised, as it seems to me, a wise discretion in not specifying the time to be devoted during the third, fourth and fifth terms to the history of England and of the continent respectively. It has left that for

each teacher to adjust according to his knowledge, his tastes and his opportunities.

AMERICAN HISTORY AND CIVICS IN THEIR RELATION TO THE GENERAL SCHEME

JAMES SULLIVAN

HIGH SCHOOL OF COMMERCE, NEW YORK CITY

I wish to say at the opening of this address that the reason why this subject was chosen was because there was some difference of opinion in the committee about its treatment. Though it was generally felt that information about foreign governments might well be given in connection with the histories of countries, as is mentioned in the printed outline you have before you, no such feeling was entertained in regard to the civil government of the United States. With these preliminary remarks I will turn to the subject in hand.

The fields of work, as recommended by the committee, stand as follows:

1. Ancient history to the 6th Century A.D.
2. European history to the middle of the 18th century including English history.
3. Modern history from 1750 to the present day.
4. American history with its English origins.

In the original draft, fields 3 and 4 stood transposed, but it soon became obvious to the committee that if the proper kind of topics were to be treated in American history a postponement of the course to the fourth year would be desirable in order to have students of an age capable of understanding thoroughly the subjects taken up. For this work of the fourth year the committee felt that at least four periods a week throughout the year should be given.

This course, as it now stands, offers three problems: (1) To present to the student clearly those portions of English history which most affected the history of this country in its origin and development; (2) To select for treatment those facts which have not become commonplaces of history courses of the elementary and grammar schools, and which will serve to differentiate very decidedly the high-school course from that which has preceded it; (3) To give a complete course in civics.

At first glance this looks as if the teacher were to be very much pressed for time in order to get so much into one year's work, but if we study the subject more closely we shall find that such will not be the case. The great trouble with courses and text-books in American history for our secondary schools has been and is that they take no account of that which the student has learned before. Facts are retailed in the high schools which have been studied again and again in the grammar schools. Our teachers and authors do not seem to realize that it is not an expansion of stories already known that makes a high-school course or text suitable for the more mature students. Still that is the basis on which most of our high-school courses are given and our high-school texts are written. In preparing this paper I have derived much interest and profit in placing a grammar-school text and a high-school text in American history side by side and in subtracting from the latter the facts which had already appeared in the former. By the time I got through there was very little left of the high-school text. When we think of it seriously this is an astounding commentary on our work today.

What is needed then in our high-school course in American history, with its English origins, is an entirely new point of view and an array of facts very different from that already presented in the grammar-schools. The Northmen, Columbus's Voyages, Balboa, De Leon, the Tea Party, and a long list of others of their like should be unceremoniously thrown out of our courses in American history in the high school in order to make way for material of greater importance and more suited to the age of the students. It is perhaps, true, as some will maintain, that the pupils have forgotten some of these stories and need to have them reviewed, but if we go on such a principle we should no sooner finish any course than we should have to take it up again. Review them lightly if necessary, but do not at any time make them the basis of the course.

The natural question now is what sort of facts shall we put in place of the many which we are to exclude. In general the object of the secondary school course in American history is to teach the student the causes for the events which he has studied in the elementary schools. Many of the simpler causes he will

have learned there already, because he could understand them, but the more complex causes should be reserved for the pupils of high school age.

For example: instead of having retailed to him the details so commonly found in high-school text-books of the early explorations and discoveries, the student in our secondary school should be taught in greater detail the underlying causes, political social and economic, which led to the beginning of such adventures. The whole structure of English society in the sixteenth century from the point of view of agriculture, commerce and industry should be studied with the view of showing why England with its population of a few millions at that time was thought to be overcrowded, and why it was that men sought investments in colonial enterprises. We still find the details of the stories of the founding of Jamestown and of Plymouth given in our high-school texts and occupying space which would far better be given over to a more complete statement of the political and economic as well as the religious causes for their foundation. Though these subjects may have been touched on in the student's survey of English history they have to be studied from the point of view of America and not of England. The narrative of the struggle for independence, and of any of our wars may well be treated very cursorily and the space and time thus saved devoted to a better understanding of the Navigation Acts, colonial smuggling, the growth of federal union, our foreign policy, the development of political parties, the tariff, public lands, industrial growth, the currency, the economic differentiation of the north and the south, slavery, and so on.

Turning now from that which we may call the history proper, we come to the question of civics. No one now seriously denies the importance of the place this subject should occupy in the secondary school curriculum, though there is some difference of opinion as to the method by which it should be taught.

Here, as in the case of history, we find that the students by the time they reach the fourth year in the high school, have acquired in the elementary schools and by general absorption a skeleton outline of American government. It is the purpose of the high-school course then not to hammer away on the memorizing of the powers of congress and the powers and duties

of the president, but to show how the government actually works; how, for example, in theory, a member of the House may rise to his feet, and getting recognition from the Speaker, hold the House spellbound by his oratorical power, but how as a matter of fact he may do no such thing. Nor is it alone necessary that the American government should be understood, but opportunity should be seized wherever possible to compare our institutions with those of foreign countries whether the comparison be in our favor or against us.

The question of method of treatment is a difficult one. There are those who believe that civics should be taught in connection with history and others that history should be completed first and the civics follow. A short examination will convince even the most skeptical that no sort of idea of our government as an organized or working whole can be gained by teaching civics at those points in the historical narrative where it seems most convenient to put it in. A course conducted on such lines soon becomes a history course with slight digressions on the historical origin of institutions, but such bits and morsels as are thus obtained never make an organized whole in the student's mind. He may get a knowledge of constitutional history and a skeleton outline of the constitution, but he will not know how his own government works. Besides this there are difficulties in the way of this treatment which are absolutely insurmountable. One example will suffice, though numerous others might be given. The year 1789 has been reached in the narrative and this seems a good and proper place to study the office of president. This is scarcely undertaken before the questions of appointments and removals, the use of the veto, disputed elections, and so on, arise. The teacher is called upon to refer to Jefferson, Jackson, Johnson, Garfield, Hayes-Tilden far along in the historical narrative and his attempt to teach civics along with the history is brought to end.

The method by which the civics is made to follow the historical narrative is open to no such objection. In the first place the historical narrative treats, in the proper places, the origin of certain institutions and gives the true historical setting to them, whereas the civics portion of the course gives a complete view of the government by treating it statically and pointing

back in the historical narrative to the changes wrought in the government since its origin.

Another point of difficulty with the first method, which might also be called the parallel method, is the extreme difficulty of dovetailing the chapters of a book on civics with those of one on the narrative history. For it is scarcely credible nowadays with all the experience that has been had in teaching civics that anyone will seriously pretend that the subject can be taught without a separate text. Many competent persons have spoken on this matter and there is still to be found anyone who will state that he has seen a course in civics successfully conducted without a separate text and but few who will maintain that the subject can be well taught as an adjunct to a historical narrative.

In summing up then it would seem that the proper way to place a course in civics in its true position would be to have it follow in the same year the narrative course in American history. There are many schools in which this arrangement is carried out with success. It does not injure the history course and it puts the civics in the position which it should occupy in all schools.

The impression seems to have become general that the committee has entered into a conspiracy to kill interest in the history courses in the high schools. There is certainly no warrant for such an impression. All the committee wishes to do is to eliminate the unimportant matter from the narratives as now taught in our secondary schools. The Committee of Seven set the metes and bounds of our course of study and the courses proposed by the present committee differ only very slightly from them. That which the Committee of Seven left undone was the selection of those topics within their fields of work which should receive treatment. The selection of such topics has been left to the makers of text-books and these have seen fit to incorporate in their narratives all of the unimportant details which have appeared in our texts for several generations back. Elimination is our cry—elimination of that which is in a text simply because it always has been in texts and not because it has any intrinsic importance for a pupil of today.

DISCUSSION

The discussion of the foregoing papers was then taken up by the following speakers:—

Dr. Eugene W. Lyttle, Department of Education, Albany, N. Y.:—Through a misunderstanding and a conflicting engagement Dr. Goodwin, in whose place I appear, is unable to be present. I regret that he is not here to discuss this report.

Perhaps in view of the changes made by the committee, since its preliminary report was published, the best thing for me to do is to present a brief outline of the history courses for high schools in New York state as planned for the next five years. It would be well before publishing these courses to have the benefit of any criticism that may come from this discussion.

A course of ancient history, as recommended by the New England History Teachers' Association, is proposed for the first or second high-school year. The time allotment for this course will be either three or five periods a week. By the use of additional topics the short course of 120 periods may be lengthened and strengthened for a course of 200 periods.

A course of European history is planned for strong high schools that wish to offer a continuous course in history for four years. This also is offered with a minimum time allotment of three hours per week or with a maximum allotment of five hours. It is known that very few schools can find a place for this course, that teachers qualified to teach the course are scarce, and it is offered principally for the sake of maintaining the ideal of a complete course of general history.

It is intended that English history be studied in the third high-school year either three periods or five periods a week.

In the last year of the high school a course of United States history with civil government is planned. The minimum time allotment for this course will probably be five hours a week. It will be possible for teachers to use separate text-books in history and in civics in this course if they prefer; but it is expected that the study of these subjects in one course will result in clearness and not as some think in confusion of ideas.

While it is not considered desirable to encourage the separate study of civics and economics, it will be necessary to offer syllabuses in these subjects for professional students and for some

students in rural districts who cannot attend school for the full year.

The courses of ancient history, English history and American history with civics will be required in all schools that fit pupils to enter normal and training schools.

J. M. Vincent, Professor of history, Johns Hopkins University:—The program of the committee, when taken as a total with the expansions of the various members appears too complicated, and requires a maturity of judgment not found in the high school. The pupil of that grade is now burdened with too great a variety of subjects. The result is seen in the choppy examination papers presented for entrance to college. There should be simplification all around to permit the attention to be concentrated to better advantage.

Speakers would agree that one of the principal objects of the secondary course is to awaken interest, but it seems to be assumed by the committee that the pupil who leaves school at this point will get no more history. It is wiser to regulate the program of public schools to suit the needs of the boy who does not go to college, but this does not require that he shall be given a complete outline of history. Let the history of certain important periods be so taught that the youth after leaving school will be impelled by his own curiosity to fill up the gaps. The same process will awaken the same curiosity in the college boy, and there will be more students who pursue history in order to be informed, rather than because they are obliged to pass an examination at the end of the college year.

Miss Louise Haeseler, High School for Girls, Philadelphia:—The proposed course seems to me ideal, provided we may have four years for history in our secondary schools and five recitations a week. But as things are now managed, it seems hopeless to try to introduce in all the secondary schools any uniform course in history requiring so much time. Take the school I represent, for instance. We have a special college preparatory course and most of our students fit for Bryn Mawr. All that is required of them by that college is a year of Greek and Roman history, or of some other branch, and because that is so I have

never been able to induce the authorities to give the college preparatory girls any more history than just that year. So in every school special conditions mold and modify the courses of instruction, making uniformity impossible. Under these circumstances it would seem wisest to direct our energies at present along two main lines; first, the simplification of the whole curriculum of our secondary schools by a process of elimination so as to get more time for history; and secondly, the securing from the colleges uniform entrance requirements in history, or better still, admission upon certificate of fitness to do college work. With more time for history and with the vexed and vexing question of preparing pupils for college-entrance examinations happily settled, we would be able to introduce into our secondary schools such an admirable course in history as the one outlined in the printed report of the committee.

The other point in the report to which I would like to refer is the statement made in it that college teachers find their classes have frequently acquired a distaste for history, and that they especially find it irksome to go over the same ground that they have covered in the secondary schools. Now this seems to me a far greater evil than any inadequacy or unphilosophical arrangement of the course, and I fail entirely to see how any mere change in the course, no matter how excellent it may be, will alter this condition. I have always considered it the aim of the high-school teacher to awaken an interest in the study of history so that it would be pursued after school days are over. For the mind of the average high-school boy or girl is too immature to grasp any but the surface teachings of history. Its deeper meanings life and further study alone can give him. I fear that if our boys and girls from the secondary schools take no interest in history after they enter college it is because they were set to doing things in connection with its study for which nature had not yet prepared them. We have been trying to put old heads on young shoulders. We have been expecting them to take an interest solely in institutions and constitutions, in economic and political conditions, in documents and philosophical controversies, in comparisons of the works of authors whose very language is as a foreign tongue to them, when nothing is real to them except men and women, and when their young

souls are eager for the inspiration of heroic deeds and great lives. The truth of the matter is the fine edge has been taken off of everything in late years by the demands of each higher institution of learning upon the next lower to do a kind of work for which its pupils are not fitted. In the effort to satisfy the demand thoroughness has been sacrificed, aims confused, and worst of all, interest has been dulled. High school boys and girls, at least in the first two or three years of the course, need to have history *taught*—they are too young, their minds too immature, their surroundings outside of school, as a rule, too uncultured to admit of their doing much investigating and comparing for themselves, and if they are forced to do it, intellectual nausea is the inevitable result. "Come, let us live for our children," said Froebel. Come, let us remember that we are teaching children —even if they do go to high school and think themselves very big indeed.

Mr. Edmund S. Noyes, Central High School, Washington:— The report of the committee, as given by Professor Robinson at the beginning of this session, of course renders irrelevant most of what I had intended to say in regard to the printed report. It seems to me as I have considered the plan in the few minutes since it was presented that it may not involve as serious changes as would at first appear from the formidable statement that the course should consist of eight units instead of four. These eight units give two years to European history, one and a half years to American history, civics and political economy and but a half year to the course in ancient history.

In regard to the course in American history I wish to express a hearty approval of what Professor Hull and Dr. Sullivan have said. The course in American history must be based upon and closely connected with European history, a difficult though necessary work. In my own classes the course in American history is elective, some of the students coming to it from the third year course in European history, some without it. By those who have had European history the assignment of topics dealing with European history is considered the repetition of work in a course which they have passed, while by those who come to the course without the work in European history those as-

signments are resented as an attempt to make them do two courses at once. The result is that no one is satisfied.

But it is chiefly upon the course in ancient history that I wish to comment. And I wish at once to add a word of commendation and approval of the following statement in the printed report:

"They heartily agree however that, in view of the long period to be considered and of the remoteness of many of the constitutional and military matters from the natural interests of the students, a mass of detail commonly included in the course should be elided in order to make a place for a satisfactory discussion of the great debt in art and literature which we owe to Egypt, Greece and Rome. Conditions and achievements rather than constitutional or political history should be emphasized."

I heartily approve of the statement because I am convinced that the first-year course in ancient history as we at present teach it is the most difficult teaching problem of the history course. The difficulty is due, as the committee suggests, first, to the length of the period to be covered—which is much greater than that of all the other courses combined; second, to the remoteness of the matter from the interest and experience of the pupil. We pretend to expect these first-year pupils, who are beginners in the study of history, to appreciate the times and conditions of Egyptians, Babylonians, Greeks and Romans considered in rapid succession when we are fully aware of the difficulty experienced by pupils of the fourth year in understanding the life and work of Columbus, Franklin, Washington, Calhoun, Lincoln and Blaine.

This remoteness of the subject is certainly not a greater difficulty than is that caused by the lack of unity of this course, which to the pupil seems to begin at any *old* place and to end nowhere in particular, and all the time he wonders what it is all about.

If our committee can only have the courage of its convictions, and the wisdom and patience to carry out its suggestion of cutting out the vast mass of respectable traditional rubbish which we try in vain to teach as ancient history and can give us a unified, consistent course which shall do the things suggested—give a knowledge of the "conditions and achievements," and I

would add, the permanent influences of the comparatively few nations that have left great and permanent impression upon the progress of the world—we can well afford to part with lists of forgotten kings, endless changes in government and battles in minor wars; and then we may have a course which can be taught profitably and which will interest the pupils, which I do not believe can be said of our present course.

Again, may not the new suggestion of the committee be a step toward the solution sought by suggesting a course which would require the elimination of all but the essentials, for nothing else could be attempted in the short course, which therefore may be the easiest escape from this difficulty ?

Prof. Andrew C. McLaughlin, Director of the Bureau of Historical Research, Carnegie Institution, commented on the scholarly character of the report made by the committee and the evidences of erudition which it gave. He then queried the advisability of making at this time changes in the general scheme of study proposed by the Committee of Seven, not because that scheme was by any means perfect, but because a continual suggestion of modification would indicate uncertainty and lack of assurance on the part of historical scholars, and also because the Committee of Seven's plan was just getting into full working order and had—one might well think—not yet been fully tested. This proposition to delay and not to advocate change too readily was given with some hesitation, because, if the body of historical scholars have made up their minds with reasonable assurance that a change is advisable, perhaps it ought to be made now. At all events, teachers have the right to feel that, even if the plan of study is not altogether satisfactory and if its parts are not so thoroughly articulated as they might be in accordance with the scheme presented by the present committee, they are still making a success of their work if they are arousing interest in historical study, which, when all is said, is the chief duty and burden of the teacher of history in the schools. This was said for fear that the full excellencies of the committee's reports and its undoubted learning might tend to discourage the successful and enthusiastic teacher who did not see the way to carry out its recommendations.

In conclusion, the speaker discussed briefly that portion of the report which had to do with the teaching of American history and civics, pointing out that the report of the Committee of Seven did not advise against a separate course in civics, but only recommended that civics and American history be taught together when there was not time for a separate course in each. If one must be chosen to the exclusion of the other, then history must necessarily have the choice; and yet there ought not to be any great difficulty in teaching a certain amount of civil government in connection with history. In fact, it would seem to be impossible to teach political history of the United States without teaching civil government at the same time, for civil government, as we have it to-day, is simply a product of history and we cannot very well close our eyes to the products of history as we study the events.

Mr. Virgil Prettyman, Principal of Horace Mann High School:—When a committee composed of college professors declares that the course of study in history in the secondary schools should be constructed to subserve the ends for which secondary schools exist; that no pressure from the relatively few students who expect to enter college should interfere with this; that no conditions imposed by the colleges should be permitted to disarrange or shorten the course in history of the greatest advantage to the future citizen who must secure from the secondary school alone whatever historic knowledge or feeling he may possess—when college professors make such a declaration, the mere school man may well believe that the "era of good feeling" between the school and college is here; that the era of feeling good for the mere school man has arrived.

If your Committee upon College Entrance Requirements in History had done nothing more than put forth this declaration of principles, its labors would have been well worth while. I congratulate you upon your wisdom. You have spread abroad among school men exceeding great joy.

Your committee, as I understand it, has before it two problems; first, to determine the best course of study in history for secondary schools, and second, to determine what parts of this this course shall be required for entrance to college. Others have

discussed the problem of the best course of study. I shall confine my remarks to the second problem, viz: what parts of the course of study shall be required for entrance to college?

Your committee reports the following facts from a study of conditions among freshmen classes:—

1st. Inability of the college, as a general rule, to make direct use of the knowledge of historical fact that a student brings from his preparatory school.

2d. Heterogeneity of preparation and vicious methods employed.

3d. No taste for history among students as a result of their secondary school experience.

I would suggest that your committee investigate the question of the responsibility for the "vicious methods" in history which produce the lamentable results evident among the freshman classes of our colleges. I am sure that this will prove an interesting subject.

What history courses should the college require in order that use may be made of the knowledge of historical fact that a student brings from his preparatory school? Can we not give up this notion that we must require ancient history for the sake of its close correlation with the classical languages? Most of our students drop Latin and Greek the moment the college permits it and several of our colleges permit this in the freshman year. We also know that few of our Latin and Greek teachers in the colleges make much use of the knowledge of historical fact in their recitations. They are still grinding on constructions and prose composition. When the teacher of Latin or Greek does wish to give a piece of literature its proper historical setting, he finds it possible and profitable to take up the history of the period so far as it has bearing on the subject in hand. I do not believe that ancient history should be required for college entrance.

If you adopt the four-year course suggested and adhere to the principles enunciated in the report of your committee, you must require for examination only those courses which appear in the last two years of the high school. If you require in examination for entrance to college a course which appears only in the first or second year of the high school you make it necessary for a student to spend time in his last two years reviewing, which

might be more profitably spent on a new field. The entrance examination makes the review necessary and the review for the examination is a cramming process, for this process gives the best preparation for an examination. No school can afford failures in college-entrance examinations, and gentlemen, we are learning to do "the stunt". In justice to the student and the schools and in the interests of history work in the colleges, you can require for examination only those history courses which appear in the last two years of the school course.

Dr. Arthur M. Wolfson, DeWitt Clinton High School:— On this subject of the course of study, until a few minutes ago, I had resolved to keep silent, because I felt amid all this discussion as though I were in utter outer darkness. But now that Professor McLaughlin has ventured to enter a protest against at least some of the points which the committee have made, I feel that I also may allow myself a few words.

In the first place, even though I believed that the change which your committee recommends were altogether admirable, I should still feel that the present time is scarcely the proper time to formulate and present such a report. When we remember that the ink with which the report of the Committee of Seven was printed is scarcely dry, when we reflect that nowhere in this country has the course recommended by that committee had the chance of a thorough trial, it seems to me that the time is scarcely ripe for us to resolve upon another change without very much more mature deliberation. The course recommended by the Committee of Seven, even though it is not perfect, is certainly a long step in advance over the history curriculum of five years or a decade ago, and therefore, it seems to me, that we teachers in the secondary schools should be given an opportunity to try it out thoroughly, to discover by experience where its strength and its weaknesses lie.

To the vast majority of teachers, to whom these courses of study are a practical and not an academic matter, these constant changes are bewildering, to say the least. Here in New York, for instance, we have been forced by the program makers to change our course of study in history three times within the last four years. Needless to say, the result has been more or

less confusion in our methods and our ideals. Few of us feel that the present course in the best one that could be devised, yet I venture to say that most of us would regard another change with the utmost dread.

Another point in the report of the committee I wish to refer to. Last year in Philadelphia nearly everyone who rose to speak on this subject attacked the report of the Committee of Seven, because, they said, the first year's work as outlined by that body was entirely too comprehensive. No class, especially not a class of beginners, could master in forty weeks the history of the world from the days of Menes, king of the Egyptians, to the time of Charlemagne, emperor of the new Roman empire. Personally I have always felt that while the year 800 is not necessarily an ideal point at which to close the work of the first year, that with that single exception, the first year's work was entirely satisfactory, that the first four or five thousand years of history could, after all, be dealt with in a very few weeks, that there was no necessity of attempting to give to pupils more than the few essential features which distinguished the civilization of these oriental peoples, which connected their civilizations with those of the later Greeks and Romans and our own. That done, the time remaining, if judicially employed, was sufficient for inculcating in the minds of pupils the essential facts in the development of Greek and Roman history, even to the time when Christianity had become the prevailing religion of Europe and the barbarian and not the Roman was the ruler of the western world.

To-day I find that the committee, supported by those who favor the report, are no longer crying out against the excessive length of the first year's work. I find that they have gone to the other extreme and would have us teach all of ancient history, not to the time of Charlemagne, it is true, but to the time of Justinian (why Justinian, whose political influence, at least, was altogether evanescent, is chosen in preference to Charlemagne I confess I do not understand), in half a year. I am afraid that my mind works more slowly than that of the members of the committee, for I cannot reconcile the fact that till this morning when the committee met to formulate its report its members were apparently in favor of shortening the first year's work with

the fact that now they recommend that all the ancient history be done in half a year. I resign myself into the hands of the program makers in despair.

One point more, Mr. President. All this discussion this afternoon, in fact almost all the current discussion of courses of study, seems to be tending in just one direction. The almost universal cry these days seems to be summed up in the one phrase which we have heard repeated so many times to-day: "Train the boy and girl to citizenship." Needless to say, I too believe in training the pupil for citizenship; but I am, I am glad to say, also one of those who believe that the schoolmaster, and especially the teacher of history, has another function, that it is his duty to see to it that those who come under his influence should go out not only as good citizens, but also as cultured men and women. I should therefore like to put in a plea when the course of study is finally settled for some work in history which will tend to develop not only a sense of civic virtue, but also a sense for and an appreciation of those things in life which we commonly call the humanities, the things of the mind and of the soul.

Mr. Smith Burnham, State Normal School, West Chester, Pa.:—The discussion this afternoon seems to me to emphasize unduly the utilitarian element in historical study and to ignore its richer cultural aspects. The training of the imagination, the uprooting of prejudice and partizanship, the enlightening and balancing of the judgment, the quickening of every generous emotion, the uplifting of high standards of rightousness and duty —in a word, the richest possible culture of the whole nature; these are the things to hold steadfastly before us in every course in history in the secondary school. A realization of these values depends not so much upon what history we teach as upon how we treat it.

Has not the thought of the committee submitting the course of study now under consideration been focused upon the subject-matter of history rather than upon the stages of mental development of the pupils to be taught in the various years? The ultimate school course must rest upon a broad basis of knowledge of what the pupils can understand, appreciate, enjoy and assimi-

late. Have the experimental psychologists yet furnished data which warrant the planning of anything more than a merely tentative curriculum? The psychological problem here suggested is not insoluble. Ought not this association to investigate it thoroughly before tinkering further with the course of study?

Mr. William C. Langdon, Pratt Institute, Brooklyn:—Mr. Chairman, there are two points I should like to make in this discussion this afternoon:

1. All history should be focussed on the life which the students are going to live. That life is the American life of the present year, 1905, and still more of the coming years, 1906, 1910, 1920, 1950, when the character of this country and its destinies will lie increasingly in their hands. It is absurd that American education should prepare American boys better for citizenship in Athens or Rome than for citizenship in New York, Philadelphia, Baltimore or Pittsburg. The history of Greece and Rome are valuable not for their own sakes but for comparison with our current life. The history of Europe and England are valuable for the vision of cause and effect leading up to the present conditions in America. As a matter of fact, our honored classical education, accorded the highest place at the educational table, is least classical in the most essential respect, preparation for the actual citizenship immediately ahead. Did Socrates focus his work on Rameses and Asshur-bani-pal or on the local Athenian district politics of his own day? We who hold this tremendous power of the teaching of history to the larger body of the intelligent citizenship ought to realize that the more important part of history, and the part that contains the *raison d'être* for teaching history at all, lies ahead of us, not behind us.

2. A knowledge of current politics and of public affairs on the part of the teacher, to some extent first hand, is essential to valuable results. A history teacher should know his government in the flesh and blood, not only in the ink and paper. He should know his alderman and assemblyman personally; he should be familiar with the operation of municipal departments and the conduct of political campaigns; he should go into local politics. Present methods of history work produce only useless citizens and help to perpetuate corruption. American education has

been graduating into the suffrage a body of citizens quite ignorant and innocent of any fitness for their sovereignty—a flock of sheep who either follow the lead of the machine politician, whither he leads, or stay out of politics altogether, grazing quietly on the hillsides of business. This defect in education can be set right only by the history teacher's becoming an active citizen himself and putting himself in touch with those who are working sincerely for good government. Not a mere instructor, text-book in hand, but a citizen leading his younger fellow-citizens into the duties and responsibilities of public life, he will make of his opportunities a power which will do much to transform our country to a true democracy, honest, intelligent and effective for the progress of the world.

Mr. C. B. Newton, Lawrenceville School, in commenting on the report of the committee, made the points: (1) that Greek and Roman history should not be scanted to one of the eight half years in the proposed scheme; and (2) that there seemed a tendency on the part of the committee to over-emphasize the economic features of historical study, which was unwise for secondary school work. Greek and Roman history can be made just as interesting and alive as more modern history, and their importance as being at the foundation of so much in modern English and American life is surely greater than much in the history of modern Europe. If the teacher has a little imagination he can impart some reality to the glory that was Greece and the grandeur that was Rome; he can compare scenes in the vivid political life of the ecclesia with present political activities; he can show how the failure of the Gracchi was similar in fundamental reason to the failure of many latter-day reformers; he can contrast the demagogue of Rome with the boss of New York, or of Philadelphia. And so in the architecture about him, in the literature he studies, in the politics of his day, the boy can be made to feel the live touch of the ancient world, and thus it may be made realistic and vivid to him. All this, together with the stories of heroic deeds, of great men and of great events means more to the average boy and girl than laws of supply and demand, and forms of economic development or decay that are so interesting to a maturer mind. We forget sometimes to keep in mind

the young point of view which is limited in its range, and especially abhors abstractions. Let us relegate the more abstruse problems to college work and keep our school work fresh, vivid, alive!

At the Friday evening session, the following two papers were delivered before a large and appreciative audience:

THE EARLY CARTOGRAPHY OF THE NEW WORLD AND ITS VALUE FOR THE STUDENT OF THE PERIOD

E. L. STEVENSON

PROFESSOR OF HISTORY, RUTGERS COLLEGE

It is not uncommon in this day for certain writers of history, when seeking to awaken an interest in their especial work, to refer to it as a neglected phase or an unwritten chapter. Sometimes it is the key to the situation which they have found, sometimes it is the last word which they speak.

The theme on which I am to address you this evening I might, perhaps, with propriety, refer to as a neglected phase; might perhaps call it a new discovery. I have not come, however, to say a last word on early exploration in the new world nor to tell how to write the history of discovery from the maps. I have simply a word to say in behalf of the early cartography of the western continent, in behalf of the maps, which often can tell us more than has been placed to their credit, certainly more in their original form than they have been permitted to tell by many of those who have attempted their description or their reproduction.

In this day when the intimate relationship existing between geography and history is receiving a more general and a well-merited consideration, when the historian is becoming more of a geographer and the geographer more of a historian, when new interest seems to be awakened in the early cartography of the new world, occasioned by a number of recent discoveries of long-lost charts to which so much importance clearly attaches, and by a fuller appreciation of the historical value of early maps, the theme on which I am to speak is therefore not one inappropriate for the consideration of this association.

It is now generally conceded that the historical atlas is one of the indispensable aids in the study and the teaching of history. Our library shelves contain many volumes of so-called historical maps, each volume with its merits, none without serious defects. Many of our histories, text-books, as well as those books of a more elaborate character, are copiously supplied with modern maps, glossed over with the historical element, or contain small but very unsatisfactory reproductions of sections of early charts intended to point the history of the period to which they belong

It is a surprising fact that very little has been attempted in our own country to encourage a systematic and critical study of old maps, very little in the way of reproduction that has been worth doing. While many of these early maps have become available for study through the work of foreign students, there are many yet in manuscript preserved in European libraries, public and private, of the highest value for the history of discovery in America which are little known, which have never been critically examined, and never have been reproduced even in part. Here is a field for American scholarship to enter; here is opportunity for a monumental publication, may I say for a monumental atlas of cartographical documents relating to a most interesting and important period, and may I further say that such a work is in preparation.

Important as early maps are for the study of history, there are many who, if they consider them worth a notice, speak of them only with contempt. Their chief interest, it is thought, lies in the fact that they are ridiculous blunders. They may serve to point a moral touching the stupidity and ignorance of those who lived in the days of yore or to adorn the tale of an early explorer; further than this they have no great practical value.

Very naturally early maps do not all possess the same value, and this for various reasons. In part, at least, it is due to a difference in purpose which the cartographers had in view in the execution of their work. Very many of the Roman maps, for example, appear to have been little more than road charts or itineraries, liberally sprinkled with pictures to indicate cities, temples and public works. With the mere outlines and the names of particular regions represented, the medieval map-makers were not content. Legends, pictures, inscriptions were

considered essential to a properly executed piece of work. "We often find in these old maps, all kinds of observations, conjectures, hypotheses from which we can learn the ideas and notions which were current at the time when they were drawn." They therefore have a value for the error they present as well as for the truth which they record. Even at a late date map features such as those to which I have referred were retained. It was thought essential by many of the early cartographers who attempted to sketch the new world that a map should be embellished with legends, with pictures of the mountains, the forests, the animals, the inhabitants, and the flags of the possessor of each particular region. The deep should be peopled with monsters which it was thought found there a home. Maps of the new world which have come down to us are but few in number compared with the many which were constructed in that early day. In the written records which have been preserved there are frequent allusions to maps on which the new lands were laid down, maps which are lost, but which if known would doubtless prove to be of great value. Queen Isabella, in September, 1493, before Columbus set sail on his second voyage, wrote the Admiral: "The map which we asked you to send us before your departure, forward it to us immediately, fully completed, and will you write the names thereon?" Michael de Cuneo who accompanied Columbus on his second voyage wrote on his return "we saw many islands, which his lordship the Admiral ordered to be inserted on the map directly." When the German Muntzmeister visited the kings palace in 1494 he saw "on a gilt table a very large and well-depicted map, fourteen palms in diameter." In January, 1495, one Ferrer sent to the king and queen "a description of the world on a plane surface in which can be seen the two hemispheres," and the Spanish envoy Pedro de Ayala, wrote in 1497, referring to the expedition of John Cabot, "I have seen the map which the discoverer made." There are yet many other like references in the literature to the charting of the new world.

It should be remembered that the original maps, the maps made *de visu* by pilots, captains and professional draughtsmen who accompanied early expeditions to the new world, with scarcely an exception, have been lost or destroyed. Those,

however, which have escaped destruction and oblivion among the unclassified and neglected material in public or private archives are copies, perhaps copies of copies, into the composition of which many coast sketches and many descriptive records have entered. Frequently we are at a loss to know the origin of a peculiar coast contour, of certain coast names, together with other features conspicuously marked. The written record does not tell us. Some of these features appear to indicate a knowledge of certain stretches of coast long before the time, when, as has been generally thought, the region was first visited. It is often forgotten that there were probably more clandestine than official voyages to the new world in the early years after Columbus brought back word concerning land discovered in the west. The written records of these clandestine voyagers, if such records were made, for obvious reasons do not appear in official accounts of discoveries. But the chart-makers could, and doubtless did, include much information thus acquired in their work, leaving unanswered questions relative to the source of information. We have much unofficial as well as official information in the early maps. I know of no other way by which certain of their characteristics can be explained.

If then these maps are to be raised to the dignity of historical documents, and are to be studied as historical sources, the same canons of criticism are to be applied to them as to other documentary sources. They are not infallible records. It should first be remembered that modern cartography was in its infancy in the day of Columbus. It was but a limited knowledge of the earth's surface then possessed even by the wisest. Of speculation concerning remote regions there was much, and this speculation was recorded in the maps, often being of that kind studiously suited to quicken the spirit of adventure. As yet no method had been devised for the accurate measurement of distance on land much less for the accurate measurement of distance by sea. Hence the numerous errors in the latitude and longitude of places represented. Doubtless many of the maps were purposely falsified in the location of certain important regions. National rivalry was intense in that day, and the cartographers were not the least among those who practised deception.

Then it should be noted that cartographers often recorded that for which search was made as if it had been actually found, either for the purpose of lending encouragement to theory in the hope that time would verify the conjecture, or for the sake of the renown which first record of a discovered coast or waterway would bring as a reward. Fictions of cartography were the occasion of many useful expeditions. Fictions we may call a number of the records made, but truths many of these records might prove to be if we had but full knowledge. Columbus found encouragement and support for his enterprise in the charts which laid down Antilia, St. Brandan's Island, the Island of the Seven Cities, and even Zipango in the ocean stretching to the west of Europe. The settlement and exploration of Dutch, English and French Guiana is essentially connected with the fiction of the city and lake of Manoa. It is interesting, for example, to note that on the majority of the earliest maps, laying down the new world, a strait is indicated between the continental areas we now designate North and South America through which it was possible to sail from ocean to ocean. For such a strait many of the early explorers made diligent search. To find it was the object of many expeditions.

It is further interesting to note the shifting of the papal Line of Demarcation to the east or west as the cartographer wished to favor the Spanish or the Portuguese claims to the newly discovered lands, or to note the distortion of the maps that coveted land areas might be made to lie within the region to which official claim had been made. Instances of the character referred to are numerous.

Much has been written concerning the belief entertained by the earliest explorers respecting the character of the newly discovered land. Some have asserted that it was thought to be land hitherto wholly unknown, a new world; others that it was thought to be a part of Asia, or that it was that antipodal region to which there had been frequent allusion in earlier days. The maps here can tell us an interesting story and they have not been interrogated as frequently as they should have been on these points.

I think we may say with Harrisse that the moment search was begun for a strait leading from oceanus occidentalis to

oceanus orientalis that moment opinion began to become conviction that a new continental region had been found, a new world had been discovered, and the maps support this idea. To find this waterway, as I have said, was the fixed purpose of a number of the explorers, and this at an early date. What they could not find, though the map-makers indicated it in the region of Central America, it seems that we now are on the eve of discovery.

It is an opinion often expressed in accounts written concerning the discovery of America that the early explorers believed the newly found land to be a part of Asia. Columbus is cited as having professed to believe this until the end of his days. But he wrote particularly of islands discovered in his first voyage; in his second he compelled his officers to swear, it appears against the conviction of some, that Cuba was a continent, and yet when on his third voyage he discovered the main land near Paria, and beheld the mouth of the Orinoco he expressed the conviction that the mighty river came not only from an immense region but from one hitherto unknown. In his fourth voyage he made search for a strait through which he could pass to the waters of India, but failing this his belief concerning the Asiatic connection it appears was confirmed.

There are no older maps known clearly setting forth a belief in an Asiatic connection of the newly found western lands than the so-called Bartholomew Columbus sketch maps of 1506. Here the connection is indicated clearly enough. Twenty years pass, however, before we unmistakably come upon the idea again in one of these early maps. From this time on, that is from about 1526, the idea was one which seemed to come and go as fact or fancy dictated until the discovery of Behring put an end to the controversy.

Very naturally one would expect to find the greatest activity in the charting of the new coasts in those countries most directly interested in maritime exploration, and among these productions to find the map types which were most frequently reproduced, but the following facts are worthy of note and are suggestive: The Juan de la Cosa map of 1500 is the only important one known, draughted in Spain during the first thirty years after Columbus opened the way to the new regions in the west;

to the careful supervision exercised by the Spanish government over maps constructed, this fact in large part may be attributed. The Portuguese influence during the same period is most strikingly pronounced in the maps extant which lay down the new coasts. In fact the great majority of the maps of the new world in the first quarter of the century are Portuguese or are of Portuguese origin. Before the discovery of America the Portugese held the leadership in maritime exploration and the fame of their enterprises was matter of common report throughout Europe. For this reason Portuguese charts may have been more popular in western lands. These people had acquired for themselves a reputation and had set the world to talking about their discoveries.

Although native Italians were among the most prominent explorers and map-makers who served the kings of Spain and Portugal, the Italian cartographers at home exhibited a tardy interest in adding these new coasts to their world maps, but after the middle of the century their work is of such character as to entitle it to rank with the best productions of the period. The Germans, though occupying an inland country, by reason of their interest in scientific studies, particularly geography and mathematics, exerted through their map work an influence upon the cartography of the new world, during the early decades of the sixteenth century, unsurpassed by that of any other country of Europe. French cartography of the west is of late origin, exhibiting in particular from the first both Spanish and Portuguese influence, while the important cartographical documents of the Low Countries and England belong to the late sixteenth century.

Maps constructed in each of the countries referred to exhibit in general certain distinct national characteristics, and this is particularly noticeable in the nomenclature or in the trend of coast line. Then there are certain insertions and omissions which have in themselves historical interest and value. While maps such as the Ribero, the best type of the Spanish, give a very complete record of discovery to date; the Pilistrina, a type of the Portuguese, omits Spanish discoveries altogether, which fact however is not to be considered as indicating a want of knowledge of such discoveries, but rather a distinct purpose to

emphasize the claims of Portugal. But early maps of this exclusive national character are not numerous. The great majority, in their general features, give a record more or less complete of all known discoveries to date.

Although we do not possess the complete records of expeditions to the new world in those early years, it is doubtless true, as I have said, that by pilots, captains or cartographers who accompanied each expedition, the coast explored was charted. Did we possess these charts, it would be easy to show how, year by year, the knowledge was extended as each expedition brought back word of some new feature. Now and then an expedition touched the western shores whose records appealed in an especial manner to the chart makers at home. This is noticeable in the case of the Cabots, the Certe Real, the Cortes, the Verrazano, the Gomez voyages. They are conspicuously mentioned in very many of the early maps.

The maps, if they do not tell a complete story, tell an interesting story, how step by step the new world became known. For every part of the continent there was a certain traditional period through which it had to pass before certainty in outline was gained, and of all this, the early maps tell the story.

With Professor Stevenson's address, about forty slides were shown including a few typical maps of the Middle Ages, a few of the fifteenth century telling of the gradual expansion of geographic knowledge in the early days of great maritime discoveries, and the typical maps of the new world during the first fifty years after the Columbus voyages. These new-world maps were direct reproductions from the originals and included the Cosa, Cantino, Canerio, Waldseemüller, Turin-Spanish, Salviati, Ribero, Mercator, Cabot, Verrazano, Desceliers, Agnese, and Maggiolo charts.

THE CHARACTER AND LIMITATIONS OF GEOGRAPHIC INFLUENCE

ALBERT PERRY BRIGHAM

PROFESSOR OF GEOGRAPHY, COLGATE UNIVERSITY

Geographic influence in history is a theme which will lead to empty discussion unless we have care. Let us begin then by asking what we mean. Is it control, about which we are talking,

and are results unerring and predictable? Have we a single, simple course, or are the factors so many and so t'ed together that geography is minor and sometimes hard to pick out? Or, is *influence* the word, marking tendencies which will bring results if not turned aside or swamped by larger and deeper things? Or shall we say that a self-determining being adjusts himself to geographic conditions and is in that sense controlled by them? Shall we not be safe in saying that we are in a field for inquiry, but not for assertion? We will not follow Buckle, in deriving civilization from environments, but will content ourselves to abandon large views, if need be, and search for evidence in the corners of our field. Among the students of biology there is yet no agreement as to the precise value of environment, in the evolution of plants and animals. If this be so, we must not dogmatize when a reasoning, and as most would call him, a free and self-determining animal, is under discussion.

Ripley, in his "Races of Europe", quotes and criticizes Taine's dictum that "human history may be resolved into three factors, environment, race, epoch." It is too simple, says he, to be quite true. Environment is physical, but it is also social. Race or heredity is vastly complex, and epoch or *Zeitgeist*, most complex of all. A reviewer of Winsor's "Mississippi Basin", commenting on his philosophical treatment of geographic influence, thinks that a new science is coming, making prediction possible. Let us not go so far as that, but curb our enthusiasm. For example, geographic features guided exploration and settlement in America, but who from the manner of their approach to the continent could have predicted that the Englishmen would win North America? The question lies further back—what made the English race? The St. Lawrence and the Mississippi Rivers guided the French down to the subtropical forests of Louisiana. Why did not the Mississippi River lead the Spaniard to Lake Superior, the Falls of the Ohio, and the Yellowstone? And either of these peoples had a better opportunity than the English, pent up on their narrow shore. Indeed, races are so lost in prehistoric time, that we can hardly hope to measure the share which physical environment had in making them. We know the Celt, the Teuton and the Slav, but I believe we do not claim to know the factors that set these

stocks upon their several lines of development. Here was momentum indeed, generated in the dim past, and projected so powerfully into later centuries that the environments of modern history must fall far short of telling the story. We are always dealing with land *and* people. Professor Freeman quotes the sentiment of an unnamed writer, that neither the Greeks in any other country, nor any other people in Greece could have been what the Greeks in Greece were. Both environment and race tell.

Mr. H. B. George, in his essay on the relations between geography and history, has asked the pertinent question: If the neighborhood and opportunity of the sea breeds sailors, why were the Phoenicians the shipmasters of the Mediterranean and the Hebrew people such inveterate landsmen? If the sea puts its indelible stamp on nations, why have the Boer farmers and trekkers of the Transvaal an aversion to the deep? Could not the storms and fogs of the North Sea and the billows of all great waters make themselves heard inland after a few paltry decades? It seems to point to swift and transient adjustment of the ingenious human creature to the place where he happens to be.

But while we raise these questions and hope to guard our thought, we will yet come freely back to Mr. Bryce when he says that we have here the "point of contact between the sciences of nature taken all together and the branches of inquiry which deal with man and his institutions."

When we take the history and geography of America, we are yet more at a loss to read the real measures of geographic influence; for we have here such a swift and magic mingling of races, as must forbid us to assign results in character or habits confidently to specific conditions of geography. And history on this continent has been too short for environment to act in its full and characteristic manner. Suppose we try to define the purely physical influence of fifty years of prairie life on the transplanted New Englander. We can be sure he is more likely to raise wheat than buckwheat, he is accustomed to longer journeys, handles more money. But if we peer into the citadel of character, who will venture analysis? We cannot shut out heredity. Did New England mold him by its rocks and snows?

Let us be cautious. Perhaps he was a picked sample, when, in the person of some sturdy ancestor, he came to New England. He was really bred in old England. Perhaps the fens did more to make him than the skies of Massachusetts. Or was it those remoter forbears that rocked on the North Sea, and that come from nobody knows where, that set your prairie farmer on his course? Indeed we can measure up the industrial, and in some degree the social and political motives of the prairie, and we can trace the forces that have made Chicago, but we cannot, in the light of geography, get at the sum of things.

When we have taken all account of our ignorance, there remain ample spheres of geographic influence in which we can know and teach definite things. No one can doubt that the great roadways across the lands are laid out by nature. Mountains have always hindered or diverted the migration of men as well as of lower forms. Valleys are ready-made highways, whose importance depends on their grades, their maturity and the regions to which they lead. Such are the St. Lawrence, the Hudson-Mohawk, the Potomac, the Ohio, the Mississippi, the Rhine. If there be tidal inflow, or deep and smooth-flowing fresh-waters, then the valley is a road in a two-fold way.

Someone has said that the great road-makers are the "buffler, the Injun and the ingineer." It is a rough way of saying that wild animals can find the best grades, that the primitive savage had keen eyes for the easiest way between remote points, and that civilized man adopts with little change the routes laid down for him by beast and primitive man. Trail, packhorse path, wagon road, canal and railway mark the evolution of the roads of the world. Not always is the valley the work primarily of a river. Great, complex structural valleys are found, like our Appalachian trough, which has been a runway for Americans from early days to the present time. Learn this valley from the Hudson at Newburg, to Northern Alabama, and you have gone far toward knowing the physiography of the eastern United States, and large parts of the history as well. Journey from Newburg to Harrisburg, stop at Carlisle, Chambersburg, Hagerstown, Harpers Ferry, Winchester, Stormton, Bristol, Knoxville and Chattanooga, follow the rugged crest of the Blue Ridge, view the great valley from the heights above Cumberland

Gap, or from Lookout Mountain, read some of the most fascinating tales of American history, remember Lee, Sheridan, Early, Stonewall Jackson, Grant, Sherman, Thomas, until you are filled with great knowledge and thrilled with a great enthusiasm, an enthusiasm that will be heightened, if back of the civil war and the migrations of the Scotch-Irish pioneers to the "dark and bloody ground," you read the story of those millions of years in which the great valley was preparing for the walks and works of its flowing, fighting, thinking human owners.

No less clear is geographic influence in fixing centers of population. Here geography and history are wedded indissolubly. If we take up the geography of cities and study it historically, we find limitless fields. We may adopt the language of the Bible, the world would not contain the books that could be written. The principle involved has modified somewhat, as human need has varied through time. Defensibility was the ancient need, when more than now, each social unit was the enemy of every other. And thus within the sprawling miles of many old world cities we find crumbling walls and antique bastions that once marked the purpose and the limits of the city's life. Lincoln was on its hill, and Sterling Castle; while on hills, also, but almost girt by rivers as natural moats, are Durham and Berne. What the city needed then, was inaccessibility. What the city must have to-day is accessibility. Its people are its fortifications, but they must hold the world in their hand, able to-morrow to reach Chicago, or next week to see Paris or London.

Apart from the world's great capitals, whose growth is especially complex, the cities of the first order must be mainly commercial, and must stand where great roads cross, or where the thoroughfares of land and ocean meet. Such are New York, San Francisco, New Orleans, Chicago, Detroit, Liverpool, Hamburg and Hong-Kong.

Around and within such commercial ganglia gather manufacturers, and all the arts that minister to the body and spirit of man. Sometimes a large town grows out of a single industry or natural product, as Scranton, in more senses than one, is built on coal. And sometimes a city of large population and vast importance is founded on the basis of a variety of natural resources, either found on the ground, or easily brought in. Such

is Pittsburg, one of the simplest types, as well as one of the most interesting, in the genesis of American cities. Yet even here we must not affirm too great simplicity, for communication, underground wealth and the mill come in, each for its share.

I commend the comparative study of St. Louis and Chicago, or Milwaukee and Chicago, of Cleveland and Cincinnati of Buffalo and Oswego, of Salem and Boston, of Bristol and London. Let the geographer ponder their history and let the historian learn their geography, each growing wiser as he traces the subtle influences enwrapped in their growth. Bristol is said once to have been a rival of London, and facing the open Atlantic might have become the metropolis of the world. But men began to make greater ships than could ascend to the piers of Bristol; the Thames is short, but its tides are deep; and London is the capital of an empire. Thus London goes on with its millions.

Consider two towns that stand where they do because a river is fordable. Oxford is one, but Oxford might now be no greater than Warwick, but for its university. Utica is about as large as Oxford. It was started by a ford, but grew, not because of a ford, nor has it a great university, but it is in natural relations to the Adirondacks and St. Lawrence on the north, and the plateau valleys on the south, while the prophets of a hundred years ago thought they were wise when they foresaw in Rome the city of the Mohawk Valley. A "carrying place" meant much then, but meant nothing when wheat and men began to move on the Erie Canal and on the New York Central Railway. Not only in cities, but in almost every village and hamlet, in a region of strong relief, we may find absorbing studies in the common borderland of history and geography.

We have already been drawn into another field, the dependence of life on industries, and industries, we may truly say, growing out of the soil. The ground facts are innumerable; climate, soil, forest, water-power consequent on relief, mineral fuel, rocks, iron, precious metals, and these economic factors entangled with those of transportation. Analyze as we will, it is hard to keep things apart, so complex is the relation of all to the common human reaction upon all. The cotton-mills of England have grown up in the north and west, while in earlier days the people, the masses of available population, were in the south

and east. There is coal in the north, but this does not answer the question. The cotton fiber is said to be sensitive to the condition of the air, it demands diffused moisture for its facile working. This it gets from the Irish Sea and the Atlantic, and a change of the wind is reported to make large differences in the working of looms. Put with this fact the neighborliness of coal and iron in the north and west, lying in strata so old that the subsoil of London is young in comparison, and we have Birmingham, Manchester, Sheffield, Leeds and Newcastle. With the progress of invention and the using of nature's long-stored gifts, there has come an enormous shifting of the population of England, so far as its balance and center are concerned.

Comparable changes are at work in our own land. The cotton manufacture is shifting from New England to the south. How much truth is in the claim that the southern atmosphere is not suited to the finest product, I do not know, but one would think that the large rainfall and often moist skies of the southern Appalachians might make a suitable home for the loom. And we have our own Birmingham and Chattanooga, where fuel, ore and flux, forest products and rich soils, full rivers with rapids and falls, mountains for coolness and long valleys for highways, point to one of the greatest unfoldings that is going on in the new world.

If we read a geographic-historic record in the fossilization of eighteenth-century life among those mountains, we are now entering on an era where the mountain white may resume his birthright of progress and of power, and when a new phase of geographic influence is at work in those northern uplands. If you call it an adjustment to nature on the part of modern and progressive men, I shall have no quarrel with you, for we shall agree that the movement is not accidental; and our appreciation of a new society and of new industries will be beyond measure enriched, if we know when those mountains were made, how the valleys assumed their type, why there is coal in the Cumberland plateau and not in the Appalachian valley, why the rainfall is great, and how this mountain land differs in every character from the lowlands into which as a vast wedge it is thrust. I can see how one might study the laws and civil history of Tennessee, having vague ideas of its geography, the knowledge, for example,

that the Mississippi washes its western end, that Nashville is farther west than Knoxville and that Lookout Mountain is not as high as Mount Washington. But if we care to know the migrations that peopled the state, if we would like to appreciate the union tendencies of east Tennessee and the confederate impulses of Nashville and Memphis, if we care to look discerningly at its new life and upon the great days that are coming, we must have more than a Century Atlas to inform us as to the physical basis and ever present conditions of this commonwealth.

A fourth field in which we can have some definite ideas is that of boundaries. How far are civil lines of division controlled by natural features and what are such features? The Berkshires and the Champlain valley are a kind of limit between New England and New York, but the mountain border at any rate is vague. The Ohio and Mississippi rivers separate states for the greater part, but let us remember that these are states and not nations, before we assize rivers as boundaries. Four of the Great Lakes lie between our country and Canada, but the forty-ninth parallel might have been fifty-four forty, and even now we should lose it without some piles of stones laid up in the Rocky Mountains, or an occasional fresh survey. The best study of boundaries is doubtless to be had in Europe, and I commend you to Mr. H. B. George's chapter on that theme. There is no doubt about England. The Channel is, to all historic times at least, a fixed fact, though we suppose a former land connection had much to do with its peopling of animals and men. For it is affirmed that Britain has no peculiar mammal, which she must have had, perchance, if her higher animal population had not sometime walked over from the continent on land that is now submerged by choppy seas. It also appears that the most primitive man known has not been found in England. This seems to point to the conclusion that the Channel is older than any man who could make a craft that would take him over to the cliffs of Dover, if indeed there were any Dover cliffs when the first savage touched that shore. At any rate all British history revolves around the central fact of insulation and consequent isolation.

The three southern peninsulas of Europe are set off from the

rest of the continent by strong mountains. Industrially these bounds are of diminishing effect, with every fresh foot road, and each new tunnel six, eight, and now a dozen miles long, piercing the heart of ranges. But the Alps would still lend spice to strategy in the event of war, while all that is old enough to be called history in central and northern Europe is conditioned by those great uplifts of the geological yesterday that reach from the Atlantic to the boundaries of Asia. But if we turn to central Europe, considered by itself, where are any insignificant natural boundaries, as between France and Spain, France and Belgium, Holland and Germany, or Germany and Russia? Let us shun easy generalizations about the race cradles of Europe, as set off by natural boundaries. Civilized man will always surmount these boundaries when he has sufficient motive to do so. And yet within bounds, their significance must be recognized and measured. That a river is not a natural boundary, needs little proof. Its opposite lands dovetail together; it is fordable here, it is bridged there. The slopes of its basins face each other, and its branches point toward the same sea as their goal. If it be the Mississippi, the north winds and the south winds invade it. Cyclone and anticyclone take their turns in sweeping across it from the western mountains until they pass the sea beyond the Appalachians. Historically, once across the eastern mountains, the pioneers and trappers, the soldiers and surveyors, the farmers and the state makers, claimed it swiftly to the base of the Rocky Mountains, and stern-wheel steamers and flatboats sailed alike from the Ohio and the Missouri to New Orleans and the Gulf of Mexico.

If there is an undisputed field of geographic influence it is found in war, whether in strategy or tactics, in country at large or on the narrow field; here geography is, indeed, not supreme, but he is supreme who best knows how to use it, men and munitions being fairly balanced. Greater numbers, resources or skill, or finer patriotism, may repel invasion, or accomplish aggression in face of geographic odds. Even poverty may repel invasion. As was said of Spain: "If you enter with a small army you are beaten; if you take a large army, you will starve." And this in turn is another way of saying that in war the issue depends almost less upon fighting than upon the supply train. Com-

munications are more to the point than bullets. Here, for example, comes in the river; follow it and it will follow you, if navigable, with men, guns, cartridges, blankets, food. Cross it, and you must guard it, and remember it, and respect it, and if beaten, fear it, it is the weak point in your line.

It was certain that a war raging in the northern colonies should make much of the Hudson, Champlain and Mohawk. It would be so again, you could not separate the keenest tests of a great war in the south from the Mississippi river, from the valley of Tennessee, from the valley of Virginia. In 1813, the allies against Napoleon at Dresden lost their left wing, because of a ravine, before unknown to them, preventing a junction. We shall see a similar condition precedent to Sherman's all-day fight on Tunnel Hill at Chattanooga, but with no such disaster as its result. But we can leave the military aspect of our theme, for it will come up again in a large and concrete example before we are done.

Geographic control is most simple and most easily read in primitive conditions of man. Spencer expresses this truth: "Feeble, unorganized societies are at the mercy of their surroundings." A river or river valley would be followed whither it would lead, and mountains would by choice be skirted rather than crossed. The desert makes nomads, and in the fertile long house, the Iroquois became, to a certain measure, tillers of the soil.

Advanced society is deliberate and inventive, sometimes almost defiant of conditions, yet is under bonds to the earth. The separating effect of mountains grows small with advancing means of communication, when powerful engines, fed from abundant seams of coal, do in a few hours what the old Conestoga freighters and the gay coaches of the fathers were days or weeks in doing. The first railway surveyors reported the Rocky Mountains of Colorado impossible to cross, and this but fifty years ago.

But mountains are more than high stone walls. They are broad belts of upland with ridges and valleys of their own. They have their climate, soil, forests and minerals, their peculiar agriculture also, to be reckoned in their total influence,

and from this total, not even highly advanced man can run away.

The discovery of new lands and seas has changed the commercial routes of the world. Artificial waterways like the Erie Canal, the Suez, the Panama revolutionize transportation, and in them men seem to overcome geographic conditions. But not so—they only use them, for the isthmus of Suez or Panama, the Mohawk valley and the Iroquois plains have only carried the task so far that man's weak hand can finish it. Mocha was once a great city. It absorbed the coffee trade of a large region. Now its palaces are empty, and a few score people wander in its streets. The steamship has wound in among the reefs of the Red Sea as sails could not do, and the Suez Canal has joined in to complete the northward drift of the market. It is geography modified by man. But even modern resources are baffled by geography. How impossible for Russia to reach out an arm for battle, that shall be at once long and strong—long enough to span a continent, strong enough to conquer an island.

Transportation and discovery of capabilities of regions lead to specializations and to the close adjustment of life to land. Even in overcoming aridity, we shall get, not merely a new type of agriculture, but perhaps a new type of society. Man is not after all an autocrat when he deals with the earth. In some future time the limits of discovery and invention may be approached, and the adjustment of man to the earth become relatively complete. Such adjustments have gone forward swiftly in our land, because of migrating frontiers and changing relations with the world at large. Only future generations can read the full and final story.

I trust I have made ample confession that the geographer should be modest in assertions of geographic control. I have also sought to show that we may find relatively simple spheres in which to trace such influence. We can read it in roads and migrations, in the growth of cities, in the rise of industries, in the tracing of mere boundaries, in the movements of war; and we can see a kaleidoscope series of changes, as modern man has more aggressively developed the resources of the earth.

We cannot believe that this is all. There is a deeper philosophy which we cannot interpret. There is a wider field—we can

only peer into it. We believe, though we may not assert, that much of heredity, of race, of the genius of peoples, is wrought up in geographic environment, bringing its pressures to bear for thousands of years. This faith will be exploded or justified as knowledge ripens, as history, ethnology and the factors of biological evolution come to be known as they are not now.

What are the fundamental and final influences of climate? Can a great civilization ever reside in the Torrid Zone? What is the real influence of the sea on maritime people? Does it color their souls, or does it offer but a casual opportunity for a development that is but skin-deep? Is Shaler right or wrong in asserting "the deep and peculiar enlargement that comes to dwellers by the sea?" Is Lucy Larcom in error when she affirms that to live by the sea is to need "a wide horizon?" Ought the sea to have made a nation of the Japanese or the Filipinos? Or did the sea find its influence lost in the overpowering effects of climate? Or do these peoples show naught but some sort of unfavorable heredity with which geography had little to do? Are mountain men high, free and courageous, or only stupid, stubborn and favored by natural fortresses? These questions uncover our ignorance, if they do not cover us with confusion.

The practical question remains—What ought we to do in this field? We are teachers, and I can only presume to say, speaking for geographers, that in my judgment, no teacher is well equipped to instruct in geography, who does not fairly know the associated history, and habitually correlate the two in his teaching. What formal correlation there should be, I do not try to say, but that the bond should be closer I believe, and the hearty interest with which you have set apart an evening of precious time seems to show that you believe it also. I would have every teacher of geography devote almost as much time to historical study as to his special preparation, although it is obvious that the history of migrations, of industries and of social types, will be more important for his purpose than the development of constitutions and the growth of foreign or domestic policies, or the machinery of civil government.

I equally believe that geography can enrich the teaching of history; that it will aid the memory, give strength and truth

to the imagination, and in large degree help to interpret courses and movements. But this is a side of the question which I may becomingly leave to the teachers of history, to say how far you need what geography can supply. It is more than an atlas that you require. Geography is more than the theater of history. It is atmosphere and soil. Freeman used maps and put emphasis on them. He travelled, also, and filled his notebook with geography. He went much in the company of Dawkins, friend and geologist, and made England, France, Sicily and Spain the more his, and more the possession of his readers and his students, because of his passion for geography.

Let geography be frankly human in its interests. Let history go earnestly back to the physical conditions on which it rests. And when the chairs of geography, now so few in this country, have become as numerous as the chairs of history, or at least have come to respectable numbers, it may well turn out that no teacher will be deemed fit for work in either field without full and strong training in the other. Meantime, some of us must seize what history we can, and atone as we may for our deficiencies in geography. We are sure to add new interest to study and fresh life to teaching.

The Saturday Morning session was devoted to reports of the Committee on History Teaching in the Elementary Schools, to discussions of these reports, and to the annual business meeting.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE ON HISTORY TEACHING IN THE ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

JULIUS SACHS

PRINCIPAL DR. SACHS'S SCHOOLS

You have undoubtedly observed, from the leaflet forwarded to you, that our committee has undertaken for this meeting to offer a preliminary statement only. It feels that it should not at this stage insist on definite acceptance of its conclusions. That it has given thought and effort to the consideration of the questions involved, will be obvious to you. In its eyes the detailed discussion of every issue presented here is of vital significance. There cannot be too close a scrutiny of every recommendation that is at variance with the prevailing teaching habit in history

The scope of the inquiry that revealed itself as soon as we began to develop plans of work would in itself have urged cautious advance. There supervenes another circumstance that has developed within the last two months, and that we cannot afford to overlook.

Quite independently of our plans, and prompted simply by the obvious needs of the situation, the American Historical Association at its last meeting determined to assign to a committee of eight the task of developing a course of history instruction for the elementary schools of the country. The influence of this great organization of historians and teachers of history is wide-spread, one may safely say national, in character and scope. The labors of its delegated committee will come to the teachers of the country as the notable effort of scholarly men to promote by concerted, but voluntary, action such a scheme as elsewhere would be imposed by official fiat. In this spirit their labors will be weighed.

At such a critical time it would appear ill-advised if we carried to final conclusions any convictions we entertained without striving for cooperation and possible agreement with the larger and more important organization. Our work need not for that reason be suspended, nor need it prove futile. The secretary of the committee of the American Historical Association writes: "We certainly want to work in harmony with your committee and at the same time to avoid duplication of effort." The experiences, then, that we gather to-day may help to clear the ground for the setting forth of a national scheme of history teaching. So much by way of explanation of a peculiar situation that at the time of its appointment our committee could not forsee.

Our committee has realized from the first that its task is in many respects a more difficult, more delicate one, than that of the committee that is to consider the secondary teaching of history. We have in a certain sense a more limited field to traverse. The youth and immaturity of our charges narrow our scope. But we must develop in our young pupils the capacity of benefitting by the upper courses of instruction or by opportunities for independent study outside of the school halls. It is virg-

in soil that is placed at our disposal. On our way of treating it will depend the possibility of vigorous growth at a later stage. If we create a false attitude toward the study at the outset, if we arouse distaste or engender indifference by poor methods, it will be difficult to relieve these conditions by later efforts, however excellent these may be.

Assuming that history is to be considered one of the most valuable cultural contributions to the efficiency of each new generation—and I assign it this place—then the first steps are as important as the work of the university. What, then, must be the dominating note in our elementary history teaching? The answer is *interest in the doings of men of our own and of other countries*. On arousing and maintaining this interest depends the successful elementary history work. The limited experience and vision of the child make men and conditions that are near to it in space and time somewhat more vital, more credible, than men and things remote. It is for the teacher to establish that relation that banishes the sense of remoteness. It is a matter of perspective and thoughtful adjustment to bring Regulus and Hannibal as near to the child's sympathies as Napoleon and Wellington. The awakening of a taste for history, a love of historical information as an intellectual and emotional experience, must be the fundamental aim of our early history work. You cannot evoke enthusiasm if you do not yourself feel it. No teacher, therefore, can stimulate enjoyment of history and historical reading who does not himself experience strong delight in the subject. Our normal schools have here an obligation that they have hitherto slighted. It seems to me that next to the teaching of our native speech and its literary manifestations, the history work is the most humanizing subject of a normal school course, and there ought to be provided here, as in literature, a particularly strong course, both informational and on the side of method. The normal school *professor* of this subject should have the wide knowledge, both of American and European history, that comes to one who has specialized in the subject; he should be competent to suggest the methods, the practical devices, that make knowledge of the subject matter effective.

In some form or other, then, enthusiasm for history is an es-

sential. It need not extend to every phase of the subject. It may well be that the economic and institutional development may not appeal so vividly to the young teacher as the records of personal achievement, of strong personality. The vital point is that you recreate before your pupils the conditions in which typical men have acted and moved.

That involves in the second place, a course of study in the art of presentation. There *is* a method of narration; its theory and practice are capable of being acquired. It should be part of the equipment of every elementary teacher from her normal school training, but conceived broadly, not pedantically. Not every teacher will reach the ideal of the perfect narrator, but everyone can become acquainted with the principles of developing suspense, anticipation; everyone can realize the value of a broad comprehensive outlook, of the interrupting episode, of the forward rush to the climax. As one of the elements toward better history teaching, I would assign an important place to such preparation, which will be helpful in many other topics as well. Training in the presentation of subject matter, so that it shall be correct in pedagogical theory and flexible in its manifestations, should be the special contribution of our normal schools to the improvement of our history work; and I would suggest that for normal schools which lack a specially qualified teacher of the art of narration, there should be available, and utilized for the benefit of the normal students, a simple handbook, dealing with this special subject. In a number of carefully prepared models of narration there should be evolved various typical forms that will be helpful to the young teacher. A close analysis of the structural features embraced in a vivid class narrative, full explanation of the means of exciting and maintaining attention, of associating contingent circumstances and leading forcefully to conclusions, will obviate anything like a mechanical repetition of mere formulas in narration. A series of models worked out in detail with numerous comments to interpret the method should be followed by a large number of exercises, in which a few facts given as a skeleton will call for elaboration. Let each teacher work out for himself half a dozen types of narrative. Let him fix his attention now upon the distribution of light and shade, lifting that which is essential into promi-

nence, subordinating the non-essential; or let him concentrate his specific attention upon the employment of graphic, telling speech, free from redundancy, and yet not meager or colorless. Let him undertake in one of the exercises to assure himself, by questions, of the mental cooperation of his pupils, and adjust his treatment to the degree and kind of comprehension that appear in the pupils' responses. Out of these studies in method, each one contributing its special advantages, the teacher should be able to evolve a composite method of narrative that employs to suit the peculiar needs of the occasion any or all the varying devices just suggested, a method sufficiently elastic to sustain in unimpaired vitality the interest of a class.

A third consideration that will be helpful in directing the enthusiastic history teacher who has acquired the technique of presentation is the wise distribution of the subject matter for the several stages of the course. There *our* work as a committee may possibly be helpful. We realized full well that two modes of procedure may be employed. If we effaced from our mind altogether what is undertaken in elementary history teaching at the present day, and what our class teachers are at all competent to handle, we might construct an ideal scheme of successive stages of historical instruction, and might adopt bodily the concentric scheme that is familiar in Germany and France, but as our elementary teachers are not sufficiently conversant with ancient and modern European history, and will not be for another generation, we propose to offer in place of what we all value as an ideal course that which is practicable. Our teachers are fairly familiar with American history, and with that as a strong nucleus, can develop around it their information on related political and social phenomena. If, then, by judicious apportionment of subject matter, our pupils at the close of the grammar-school period shall have acquired a clear knowledge of our own history, proper to their age, and with it the enthusiasm for historical information, for a comparison of the growth of other communities on lines similar to, or divergent from, our own, then a definite goal will have been reached.

How shall this be effected? By the treatment of our history in carefully delimited stages, each period fully and finally presented at a given point in the curriculum. Our committee is

unanimous on the value of this division of American history into a series of stages. We think that it lends itself very naturally to the growth in maturity of the elementary school pupils. The individual efforts of the first discoverers and of many of the pioneers, their personal characteristics which fitted them for their success, make a wholesome appeal to the pupil at the stage when he looks upon the hero as symbolic of the possibilities of the race. Certain historic figures will always claim his attention. They are what the mathematicians call constants; but there is ample room for the play of individuality in the selection of the re-remaining historical characters introduced at this stage.

There follows the stage of concerted movement in settlement, and of the shaping of states. The typical Puritan does not impress by his individual achievement, but by his participation in the social and political environment of his time. The individual gives way to the marked tendencies of a general social impulse. As the epoch of the individual—discoverer and pioneer—forms in the child's mind the background out of which colonial organization grew, so the Revolutionary War, from the first mutterings of discontent through domestic and international entanglements, through despondency to the swelling peals of complete victory, is distinctly epic, heroic in character, with a whole people as the hero, in place of the individual. We are not straining a point when we regard growth of our national life and of our national ideals after the war of independence as the evolution from the epic to the calmer institutional period in our existence.

It is singular that this fortunate alternation in conception, in point of view, has not led before this to a distinct separation of the several epochs in our history work. Each period will gain appreciably by detailed insistence on one epoch. It requires abandonment of the idea that a bird's-eye view as a preliminary to later courses is desirable. Various causes have perpetuated in our schools the belief that such a rapid perfunctory glance over the whole of American history is possible, and that those who do not complete the grammar-school course should at least see in outline the whole course of events. We have all learned to know what such a bird's-eye view of a vast subject means. It calls for a style of text-book whose statements are either bald, and hence unattractive, or complex and confusing. That which imparts

life and color to the narrative is inevitably sacrificed. In this connection one of our committee says: "Even though some children would not get more than the underpinning, it is better for them to have solid ground under foot, if only a very little, than several years of the smattering which is our American foible."

With the division of the subject matter through the four years of the grammar grades, there must go hand in hand a selection of teaching material which must be fitly chosen to meet the successive years of mental growth. The authors of our text-books fail usually to recognize that there is a great increment of intellectual advance between the ages of ten and fourteen. It is not conceivable that a text thoroughly within the range of a lad of ten will satisfy the needs of one three or four years older. No one seems to write for a definite stage of comprehension of things and facts. Grading in text-books has been but crudely attempted. The analysis of certain text-books will probably be offered by some of our subcommittees. We should know what themes are to be chosen for treatment and what constitutes adequacy of treatment, and a dispassionate statement of the merits and demerits of well-known school histories should lead to the production of superior text-books in the future.

From the report on the history teaching in the secondary schools we have gathered how injurious to secondary and college history work is the lack of sharp distinction in the character of the work. There is no special field set aside for the secondary period, and in method of treatment it often, and unwisely, anticipates what should be college work. College instructors deplore frequently the fact that the keen edge of enjoyment of their history work is lost because of the vagueness of method in the secondary schools.

It does not seem so difficult to avoid this complication in the elementary stage, where the appeal of history is particularly what Froude would have all history teaching be, "an appeal to the higher emotions, rather than to the understanding." Sympathy, interest in the great actors of the drama of our national life is vital. We need not in our elementary schools construct our history teaching on the lines of a formal mental discipline. It becomes involuntarily, and for that we value it so highly, a training of the judgment.

Recognizing, then, that as a specific subject, American history is for the present, and for some time to come, the only phase of the world's history in which we can demand sufficient knowledge of our elementary teachers, we make it the pivotal history theme of the elementary school. We recognize the value that a knowledge of ancient and modern European history possesses for the understanding of our own history, but we must for the present secure this basis by a system of correlation with other subjects of the curriculum. My associates will set forth in detail their views on this matter and the grounds that have prompted all of us to formulate moderate, rather than ideal, demands. We shall not need to go far afield to convince you of the wisdom of this policy of moderation. The resumé of our present-day history teaching in the grammar schools that Professor Monroe and his fellow members have collated will indicate fairly both the limitations and the possibilities in this field of educational work: the scantiness of the history teaching shows the uncertainty in certain quarters regarding its proper place in the curriculum; there is lack of agreement as to its function; the soundness of viewing it primarily as a conduct study, and thus making the supreme aim what some would consider incidental is questioned. On these debatable points my colleagues now claim your attention.

ACTUAL CONDITION OF INSTRUCTION IN HISTORY IN THE PUBLIC ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

PAUL MONROE

PROFESSOR OF HISTORY OF EDUCATION, COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

This committee was given the task, somewhat indefinite and certain to be somewhat inconclusive, of discovering the actual status of instruction in history in the elementary schools of the middle states and Maryland. Such information was to be gathered, if possible, concerning the work of both rural and city schools. The information was to be gathered primarily from members of the association through the assistance which the secretary of the association very kindly rendered. However the scriptural injunction with promise—"Give and it shall be given unto you"—applies in secular matters as well as in others, and certainly is applicable in this case, for the members of the

association did not respond very generally, and consequently no generous reply can be made at this time. In fact, this information was so scattered that no general conclusions could be reached from it. Two other sources of information, however, were used; first, the printed material issued in connection with the adopted courses of study for states and counties; and second, the investigations of some students of mine in general educational work, whose activities could be controlled somewhat more directly than those of the members of the association. Materials relating to three types of schools were received; rural schools, in which the information was chiefly from printed sources; city graded schools, covered by the investigation and by some material received from members of the association; and private schools from which very general response was received from the members of the association. Concerning this last type of schools, however, notwithstanding the more ready response to the *questionnaires* sent out, there is so little uniformity of work that few conclusions of value could be reached, save that the attention given to history is more general in the private schools than in the public schools; that they are somewhat better equipped with material, and that they depend more upon the general knowledge and work of inspiration of the teacher and less upon the text than do the public schools.

In regard to the rural schools of the five states within the association, but one had adopted a general course of study including history for the grades. This is the Maryland course, which largely follows that of Massachusetts and is similar to that of many of the central western states. These general characteristics were to be noted in those states having an adopted course of study: 1st, instruction in history extends over a much longer period of time than is general in those states where there is no state course—from the second year in the grades, where it appears as biography, myths, etc., but as a part of the regular course, through the high school; 2nd, history work is continuous in these schools and appears as a more consistent and well-organized course of instruction; 3rd, a much wider selection of material is given including stories from ancient and medieval history, organized again upon some definite basis depending upon the grade of work; 4th, more distinct recognition is given to civil

government and to local and state history; 5th, there seems to be less repetition of material and better organization in general. The questions raised by the comparison of these two types of states are: (1) Is it wise to recommend a state adopted course of study? (2) To what extent is it wise to recommend text-books for such adopted courses? The third question which the investigation could not determine, but which is a vital one, is, To what extent are such adopted courses of study carried out, and to what extent can they be, in every locality?

This summary of teaching in the city schools is based upon the analysis of the curriculum in fifty cities from various parts of the United States. From these courses of study it appears that history is included as a definite subject in ten of these cities in the first grade, in eleven in the second grade, in twelve in the third grade, in twenty-one in the fourth grade, in thirty-five in the fifth grade, in thirty-one in the sixth grade, in forty-one in the seventh grade, in forty-six in the eighth grade, and in ten in the ninth grade. Out of twenty-three subjects mentioned as constituting the elementary curriculum, those subjects which were given more frequently and more continuously than history were: reading, writing, spelling, arithmetic, language and composition, geography, physiology, nature study, physical training, drawing, music. In other words, history comes twelfth in frequency and permanency of position in the elementary school course.

Of the selected ten for those cities representing various portions of the country, as well as the particular regions coming within the province of this association, some further facts were discovered. The percentage of time of the elementary school given to history varies from 3% at Cleveland and 3.6% at Boston, to 6.6% in San Francisco and 6.7% in New Orleans. In general it appeared that history was given more time in the west and somewhat more in the south than in the east. The subjects which were given greater emphasis in time allotment in New York City, where history received 4.33% of the time, were: opening exercises, writing, language, arithmetic, geography, constructive work, physical training. In other words, history ranked fourth in the amount of time allotment of the entire school course. The average amount of time for the ten selected

cities in each grade was as follows: first grade, 4%; second grade, 4%; third grade, 4%; fourth grade, 1.2%; fifth grade, 3%; sixth grade, 5.2%; seventh grade, 11.1%; eighth grade, 12%. It is interesting to note that in the seventh and eighth grades there are only two subjects that average higher in the time allotment. These are language and arithmetic.

Some general tendencies may be noted from this investigation and some general questions raised, though there is probably nothing new in these other than a confirmation of general impressions. First, there is evident a very general tendency toward the introduction of biographical and historical tales into the lower grades. Second, this material is now being given a place as a definite part of the curriculum. While much of it may be merely simple reading material, yet there is coming to be a definite organization into the curriculum and a definite recognition of the subject as history. The importance of this point is to be recognized when we remember that the teacher's aims are very different in reading from that in history work, and the results obtained are apt to be, or at least should be, very different. Third, this tendency reveals a very general use of Greek and Roman myth and legend as well as historical and biographical tales, and a growing tendency to select more and more from the Middle Ages. And the question is raised whether the time is not near at hand for the attempt at organization of these subjects into a more definite course of instruction, to divide with the material of United States history the time and the interest of the students.

Finally, one further subject of interest was suggested by these investigations: namely, the organization of the material. A long list of important topics from history as well as from a variety of other subjects were submitted to these cities with an attempt to discover in what grade each was taught and what relationship might exist between the presentation of the topics. The thing which was significant in regard to history was there was absolutely no agreement. For example, the topic of the discoveries is taught in two cities in the third grade, in four cities in the fourth grade, in two cities in the fifth grade, in three cities in the sixth grade, in four cities in the seventh grade, in one city in the eighth grade. Likewise the colonial period appears from the third to

the eighth grade, and the same is true of almost every other topic in American history. Some topics which seemingly are of major importance were hardly treated at all as separate topics. That of political parties, for example, was taught only in one city, that of the Monroe Doctrine in three. The general results of the investigation was to demonstrate that there is only one subject in the elementary school that possesses a less definite organization, and that is nature study.

A number of questions were raised about this latter phase of the investigation. First, can there be any organization of the historical material and arrangement of these important topics, so that there can be a more general agreement as to the time when taught? For illustration, there is not only no agreement as to the use of local history, but further no agreement as to whether it should be introduced or given a place in the curriculum. In some cases it is an introductory topic, in others a topic for conclusion of the course, in others made wholly subordinate. Now it may not make much difference from the historical point of view, or from the point of view of the historical material when such subjects are introduced or in what arrangement the topics may be followed, but from the educational point of view—and this is the point of view which must be borne in mind when we are discussing the subject of history in the grades—these questions are of tremendous importance. In a similar way these investigations reveal no uniformity in the conception of the purpose of history teaching. The same variety is to be found here. For the most part the old factitious purpose of inculcating patriotism seems to prevail. So long as that is true, or so long as the "moral" purpose alone, or the intellectual, is accepted, prevails, there can be no definite agreement as to arrangement, as to method, or as to selection of topics. It is only when we get the broader view of the use of history as a most important means of relating the child to his present life through an understanding of its institutions, its social forces, its political activities and ideas, that we have a truer basis for the settling of these questions of professional interest concerning the teaching of history in the grades. Our investigation could reach no conclusion concerning the topics or methods of instruction favored, the use and selection of text-books, the use of courses, the use of

local history, the use of supplementary reading, or the use of any particular recitation method. Probably the only general agreement to be reached is that there is less agreement regarding these places of history teaching than in regard to any other subject in the elementary school.

FOUNDATION WORK IN HISTORY IN THE FIRST FOUR GRADES

CHEESMAN A. HERRICK

CENTRAL HIGH SCHOOL, PHILADELPHIA

Your committee suggests that the subject offered for history in the first four years be selected along the following lines: (1) seasonal history—in connection with holidays, especially biographies on the anniversaries of great historical characters and also in connection with current events; (2) mythology—selected myths from those of the oriental nations, Greece, Rome, and the Teutonic peoples; (3) folk-lore with accounts of primitive life, especially among the Indians and Eskimos; (4) simple narrative history with emphasis on biography and adventure. An especially promising form of narrative histroy is that dealing with life in the early settlements and on the frontier in our own country.

In the main the suggestions made above must be carried out through oral presentation which may be either by recitation or reading on the part of the teacher. The power to interest children in history through oral recitation is of unquestioned value and in addition is a power to be easily acquired by those who set themselves seriously to the work. Well-selected material, thoroughly mastered by the teacher herself, and vividly, presented will not fail of its object in the field of history.

The material for this work already exists—perhaps in too great abundance. The problem is to select and collate it. Books of mythological tales are so numerous that it hardly seems necessary to mention any, but perhaps the series by Guerber is, on the whole, the most satisfactory. There are now available a Hiawatha primer and a volume on Indians and pioneers by B. E. Hazard. "Pioneer History Stories," by Dr. Charles McMurry will be found of value. Mention should also be made of Andrews' "Boys Who Lived on the Road From Long Ago,"

and Eggleston's "Great Americans for Little Ones." "Special Method in History," by Dr. McMurry should also be mentioned. There are so many books from which to choose that this list is necessarily inadequate—it may also be faulty, but it is offered as a point of departure.

It is to be hoped that at some future time the details of the general plan above suggested may be more fully marked out. For the present we have dealt only with the broader phases of the topic assigned. To gather up this brief discussion the following conclusions are offered: (1) foundation work in history may be judiciously distributed through the first four years, (2) subject matter for this instruction should be seasonal history, current events, mythology, folk-lore and primitive life, and simple narration of personal adventure and frontier settlement; (3) the method of presenting this material must be largely in connection with or incidental to the other work of the school; (4) local conditions in communities and schools should largely govern in the selection and presentation of material; (5) the advantage arising from this early work in foundation history are conceived to be twofold—the cultivation of a proper historical temper of mind and that best of all services, the giving of a correct attitude toward life.

THE WORK OF THE FIFTH AND SIXTH YEARS

DR. JULIUS SACHS

Much that pertains to the work outlined for the fifth and sixth school years has already been referred to in the general introduction. While we do not *insist* on the oral teaching of these two years, we strongly urge it upon teachers, both because it is peculiarly appropriate to the subject matter under consideration and because, when properly handled, it enlists to an unusual degree the sympathetic coöperation of the pupil. The appeal in the scheme of these two years it to the personal responsiveness of the pupil, through the striking qualities of personality in the typical figures and movements chosen, and it is best made by the aid of personality in the teacher, by his voice, his power of dramatization. There are those who discountenance the elements of the picturesque in history teaching, claiming that no glamour should obscure the vital truth; but we must utilize all elements

that constitute an appeal to the imagination, the emotional side of the young pupil. The narrative art of the teacher ought to render the progress from incident to incident far more effective than in the record of the printed page.

Coming now to a more specific consideration of the fifth year work, the general subject would be the discoverers and pioneer life. The themes should not be too numerous; thirty for the school year would be ample, each topic to be resolved into two or three divisions, as the progress in the story or in the succession of stories will suggest. A well-defined topical arrangement is necessary, so that the child can in turn recreate in thought and language the details of each theme, with all the vividness that results from full grasp of the environing circumstances. If the outline presented to the pupils marks distinctly the several stages in the progress of the narrative, their minds are likely to retain control of it. The repetition of the biographies in sections or as a whole by the pupils should be a vital feature of the work. It determines correctness of conceptions on points of history or in manner of presentation. What we teachers want at this stage, quite as much as the pupils do, is a good story, not a condensed statement of an array of facts. Teacher and text-book will naturally pass from record of facts to interpretation of facts. Such interpretation will be based on knowledge of conditions, political, social or otherwise. It should, however, distinctly avoid a systematic generalization; that would be premature for pupils at this stage. Typical themes for this work would be the Indians, Columbus, Magellan, Drake, Raleigh, Cortez, De Soto, Hudson, Smith, Boone, Champlain, La Salle, Marquette, Joliet, Frontenac, Revere, Washington, Clark, Samuel Adams, Patrick Henry, Marion, Hale, Fremont. The selection of local or sectional heroes, simply because they are such, is not to be urged. "Local history has generally been a failure as a method of approach in history instruction." Furthermore, the single state, in contrast to the United States, is not to be impressed on the child's mind as a specific unit. While chronological conditions should not determine the order of study at this point, a chain of relation in time and locality is easily established. A bibliography for a series of, say forty themes in American history, from which the thirty are to be chosen, could be easily arranged. This should

be more, however, than a mere list of publications. There should be a genuine statement of the available sources of information, even to chapter and page, such as an earnest teacher had actually selected in constructing for himself a picture of a certain hero or a group of men. No one man would be likely to do this well for the whole list, but half a dozen teachers, distributing the topics among themselves, ought to accomplish it without difficulty. I would add to the value of such information if a classification of the source material as elementary or advanced, *i.e.*, research, or collateral material, were instituted.

In the sixth year work, the subjects of colonization, colonial development and organization are to be made prominent. That would naturally include the events and general movements of the exploration period, the spread of settlements under definite leadership, the growth of the colonies, with the physical and spiritual obstacles that they encountered. The influence of personal leadership would still be a vital factor; they would, however, now be primarily leaders of communities. Such figures, therefore, as Cabot, Cartier, Winthrop, Standish, Bacon, Stuyvesant, Eliot, Roger Williams, William Penn, Montcalm, Franklin, Jonathan Edwards, help us in interpreting the conditions of the communities in which they were active and which they helped to develop. The communal spirit as such would be treated topically, under such heads at the Puritans, the Jesuits, the Quakers the Germans, the Dutch settlements, the uprising against tyrannous governors, colonial life generally, etc. Selecting, again, about forty topics, it should be possible to carry out a study of the colonial period complete enough and definite enough to make no later repetition in the grammar schools necessary.

If text-books are to be written to correspond with this new arrangement of subject matter, they should be conceived as a series, so that the facts made prominent in the earlier books of the series may be utilized in cross references, in summaries, epitomes, etc. Existing series of text-books pay little attention to these valuable aids, mainly because there is rarely a guarantee that an earlier book will be followed by another of the same series.

Altogether, the adjustment of work in these two years must be the closest possible. Odious and superfluous repetition must

be avoided. As the compass of the work is moderate, it should be feasible to establish correct views in place of indefinite concepts. The erroneous idea of the isolation of American conditions, which is directly traceable to much of our teaching, can be combatted in this scheme by care and discretion in the use of reading matter. Parallel characteristics and parallel conditions in American and modern European history are to be found, or else conditions that will illuminate our problems. Where a direct and definite relation with Europe exists, it should be brought out, and it would always contribute some light to what would otherwise be a disconnected phenomenon. These we conceive to be the lines along which more successful work in these two years can be effected.

THE WORK OF THE SEVENTH AND EIGHTH YEARS

FREDERIC L. LUQUEER

PRINCIPAL OF PUBLIC SCHOOL NO. 126, BROOKLYN

The present tentative recommendation of the committee for history work in the seventh and eighth years would be a mean between two extremes.

One the one hand, American history, and nothing but American history, throughout both the years; on the other, English history, and English history alone, in the seventh year, with a rapid review and study of American history in the eighth year. This is the plan adopted by the present course of study of the schools of New York City.

Against the first plan—that of studying American history solely through the seventh and eighth years—it is urged that the proper historical setting is lost. We cannot build a house without planning the foundations and taking into consideration the sunrise. In developing the American historic sense and imagination, the European foundation must be sketched and the relations with the nearer and the farther East.

Against the second plan—that of studying English history alone in the seventh year, with a return to American history in the eighth—it may be urged that for the elementary school the break in the American history is too long, and that the gap itself is filled by a subject too vast and too intricate for satisfactory work during one short year.

England, moreover, is not the only source of American life. Spain, France, Holland, all are springs sending forth streams of shaping influence upon the new world.

Between these two courses there is a middle way. It would aim to make American history the central study of both seventh and eighth years; but with conscious effort to understand the European conditions leading to and accompanying the growth of our own country.

In this brief presentation there is but space to indicate the main divisions of the subject, the part of American history that may be assigned to the seventh year, and that for the eighth, and some of the points of European origin, contact and influence.

The age of the pupils must be kept in mind. The work should be largely biographic; the appeal, to interest and to imagination. The dangers of too great digression, and of bewildering detail must be avoided. The problem is not a little one.

In the classroom only a limited time can be given to the study of history, perhaps two or two and one-half hours a week at the most. The attempt should not be made to cover too long a period, nor to touch upon any but the more important characters and events. But these should be clothed with a wealth of interesting detail. The study should give the rich material for generalization. The generalization, the world-movement, should be in the teacher's mind as a touchstone for choosing the essential. But he must be artist enough to mold the essential into striking and individual form so that it may be realized by the young pupil.

For the seventh year, let the work be American history, through the Revolution; for the eighth year, from the adoption of the constitution to the present time.

The seventh year's work will include a study of the discoveries, explorations and early settlements, of the colonial development, and chiefly of the Revolution which gained for the colonies a place among the nations of the world.

The earlier part of this work, in a sense, is a review of the sixth year's study, but from a different view-point. The facts of the American history that were clothed in interesting story for sixth year pupil are here made more precise by the aid of the text-book, *but the horizon is widened*. We for a moment stand at the side of the explorer and visit the colonist, but we make longer

stay in the world from which they came, learning of its trade, its government, its peoples, its hopes and visions.

The history of the seventh year might be begun with simple map studies of the world known to the fifteenth century. Here the pupils must seek to imagine away part of their geography. They must travel with Marco Polo, and come back filled with the mystery of the far-away East. They must traverse the few routes of Euorpean commerce. They must learn of the capture of Constantinople by the Turks, and find that way to the East thereafter closed against them. Something of the new birth of knowledge must be felt as they meet the scholars who have fled from Constantinople. Their pulse must beat quicker at the news that Columbus has found a western way to India; and that Da Gama, too, has reached it by circumnavigating the great southern cape. The sailors are guided by the needle that points true across stormy and unknown seas. And, at home, the news of heroic adventure, of golden discovery, and of unexplored promise is gathered by hungry eyes from the output of the newly-invented press.

Now let there be a brief study of the European nations that explored the new world and carried thither their old-world rivalries and ambitions. Their pioneers could see but a little way. Hardly did they feel that for

> "Them waits the New Land;
> They shall subdue it,
> Leaving their sons' sons
> Space for the body,
> Space for the soul . .
> They shall make over
> Creed, law, and custom;
> Driving men, doughty
> Builders of empire,
> Builders of men."

In this study something must be presented of the growth of monarchies, of the position of the Church, of the struggle between Inquisition and Reformation; of the foundation of the great commercial companies; of the beginnings of popular education, freedom and representative government.

Spain led in discovery and exploration. It was perhaps the mightiest power in Europe. The kingdoms of Aragon and Castile were united under the rule of Ferdinand and Isabella. At first much of their realm was in anarchy. Orders of knighthood were renewed and strengthened to aid the monarchs in gaining the supremacy. The Inquisition was established. The Moors of the south were overthrown, and the Jews expelled. Wider dominion was craved. Columbus pointed the way. DeLeon, Balboa, Cortez, DeSoto, followed. Mines of gold, fountains of youth, ancient kingdoms were sought; the new continent was traversed and the Pacific seen from the heights of Darien.

The call of the wild adventure was upon these men; but back of them were the policies and ambitions of Spain.

In 1517, however, Luther nailed to the Wittenberg church his theses—a first breath of the modern spirit of individual freedom. Against this spirit, strongest in Holland, Spain fought a losing battle for ninety years.

England under the Tudors declared independence of the Pope, and became the enemy of Spain. Interest in America as the war-treasury of her antagonist was aroused in England. Bold English seamen under Drake and Hawkins captured the gold-laden ships of Spain. Her fighting fleet also, the invincible armada, was defeated and scattered, and the way cleared for English colonization in America.

Long years before, John and Sebastian Cabot had touched the mainland and established one claim of English right in America. In Elizabeth's time, further claim was made by new discovery and actual possession. Raleigh, in 1584, was given a patent authorizing him to "hold by homage remote heathen and barbarous lands, not actually possessed by any Christian prince nor inhabited by Christian people, which he might discover within the next six years." Raleigh and others were eager to discover and to possess. Hakluyt urged that a great commerce would grow up with the new world, and that there was a home provided for the surplus population, as he conceived it, of over-peopled England.

It was Shakespeare's England; but not Shakespeare alone was Fancy's child. The first colonists dreamed of easy gains, of fruitful harvests and of pleasant days. Then came the bitter

lessons of shipwreck, of savage butchery and of the starving time. Then followed the chastened, sturdy effort to cope with the wilderness by men more fit and with needful equipment.

Soon came the Puritan movement in England; the going to Holland of the pilgrim band, and its further vogage to the New England coast. The Pilgrims bore the torch of liberty; to be held aloft by no soft goddess arm, to be sure, but fixed upon a rock. That beacon was lighted in England. To understand and to interpret its shining, something of the history of England during the reigns of the Stuarts must be learned. The song of Cromwell and his Ironsides on Marston Moor must be heard. The Restoration, the Revolution, the reign of William and Mary must be studied.

Puritanism grew to be a power. From its fold, between 1630 and 1650, came the founders of Massachusetts and Connecticut, men belonging to the upper middle class of society.

But England had not yet learned toleration. The sect of Quakers, for instance, was everywhere ridiculed and met with rude treatment and scant justice. It has been said that "the Stuarts punished the Puritans because the Puritans had hurt the Stuarts and were formidable foes. Everybody seemed to persecute the Quakers for no better reason than that they never hurt anybody and were ridiculous." But the king was in their debt. From the father of William Penn, Charles II. had borrowed £16,000. He met this obligation by the grant of Pennsylvania to the son. Penn became interested in colonizing ventures. He drew up a code for the government of the colony of West Jersey. "It was the pioneer of all codes," says Buell, "that now express the essential doctrines of self-government."

This is another instance of the truth that in England itself the idea of civil liberty had been worked out. In developing the proper setting for the study of American nationality, this truth must be made especially clear. Says Fiske: "It is to the self-government of England, and to no lesser cause, that we are to look for the secret of that boundless vitality which has given the men of English speech the uttermost parts of the earth for an inheritance."

But across the channel there was another great nation—France, active in exploration and colonization.

In our seventh year history, a brief view of this country must be had—enough to bring out the contrast between its government and that of England. France, a centralized despotism, exercised its principle of government over its American colonists. In none of its remote settlements could self-government be developed. And herein is to be seen one of the causes of superiority of the English colonists over the French in the significant struggle of the so-called French and Indian war—a struggle so significant that Fiske would have us admit "that the triumph of Wolfe marks the greatest turning-point as yet discernible in modern history."

It must be realized that to a large degree colonial history is European history. An interesting illustration of this is cited by Morley, in speaking of the great pivotal contest but just mentioned. "Two days after entering Fort Duquesne the brave Forbes . . . wrote to Pitt, the minister whose work he was helping to consummate: 'I have used the freedom of giving your name to Fort Duquesne, as I hope it was in some measure the being actuated by your spirit that now makes us masters of the place.'"

The very Declaration of Independence did not spring from America alone. England had breathed its spirit and shaped its language. The courage that enforced it had been tempered in similar struggles from Magna Charta on.

"Ah, do not fail to count up," exclaimed Morley in a recent address—"do not fail to count up, and count up often, what a different world it would have been but for that island in the distant northern sea!"

It is this counting up of what our country owes to others that we would urge in the study of American history, and of American history with its European background.

We have sketched but a partial outline of the background for the seventh year's work. In the eighth year, the history of the United States, the new nation, is to be studied. At many points there is connection with the history of Europe that may be brought out by a study of cause, or of similarity, or of contrast.

Let all pupils and teachers study this aspect of our history with increasing sympathy and wisdom. Such study will increase

the spirit of toleration, of respect for other nations, of the understanding that would make for peace in the world.

SOME PROBLEMS CONNECTED WITH THE WORK

WILLIAM H. MACE

PROFESSOR OF HISTORY, SYRACUSE UNIVERSITY

Any revision of a course of study involves a readjustment between subjects. Whether there is room for more history work in the elementary school partly depends on our ability to readjust subjects and teaching. Elementary history work is intimately related to at least two subjects of the course of study—home geography and reading or language work. From birth to school the child gathers sensuous impressions of man and what he does and of the earth and what it does. Out of matter thus obtained at first hand, the child tries to picture and to understand the geography of countries far away in place and the history of countries far away in time. The course of study very early puts the child to gathering more systematically geographical material from his environment. But that phase of this home geography which deals with man is as vitally connected with history as with geography. If the teacher knows this the following results may grow out of such work: (1) the gathering of picture-making matter for the imagination; (2) the gathering of apperceptive matter for the judgment; (3) the creation of a permanent interest in local institutions. These results can be reached without disturbing the course of study.

History easily dovetails with language early in grade work. Here the story is the great instrument of instruction, and the simplest form of it is the fairy tale, the myth or legend. In form and spirit these are literary rather than historical. They are the products of the creative imagination—inventions. While they deal with men and women, the characters are idealized, are not men and women of flesh and blood. Such stories are primarily for reading and language, but since their characters resemble real persons they give pupils more or less experience in getting the meaning and purposes from their deeds.

The story of the type of Jane Andrews' "Ten Boys" is on the border line between literature and history—partly literature because the characters are creations of the imagination and partly

history because the facts and conditions are real. Such a story if well told, and if true to fact, lends itself equally well to both uses.

The story of the real historical person is distinctly in the field of history, but may serve as a reading or language lesson. Here again little readjustment is required.

A third problem relates to the choice of a beginning point for the story of real historical persons. Shall the first stories be from Greek, Roman, English or American history? The culture-epoch theory leads some to favor beginning with ancient history stories, while the kind of picture-making and apperceptive material possessed by American children argues in favor of stories taken from American history.

The fourth form of the story is the story of event—a story which belongs to the grammar school and which should be one of the features of the grammar school text in history.

WHAT A PARENT MAY REASONABLY EXPECT A GRAMMAR SCHOOL COURSE IN HISTORY TO DO FOR HIS CHILDREN

ADOLPH RUPP, M.D.,
NEW YORK CITY

Most mothers to whom this question is put will modestly refrain from giving an explicit answer. Most fathers will say such a course should help to make their boys and girls good Americans.

One fact to which the previous speakers have not explicitly referred is the great change that has taken place within the last fifty years, and particularly within the last twenty-five years, in the character of the parenthood of the country. Such a fact must certainly influence the character of the history that is taught in the grammar schools of the country

History should be taught with and for a purpose. As a physician I would take issue with Anthony Froude, as quoted by Professor Sachs, against history being used to develop, or as being addressed to, the emotions. Rather should it be addressed to the understanding with the purpose of developing the understanding. Not, however, for the purpose of understanding history; for, as Curtius held, no human being can understand

history. History, said Curtius, is of the nature of cloth that is woven of nodes with threads that run in two directions. The present time, the nodes; and the string running in opposite directions—the one into the past, the other into the future—and the future cannot be foretold.

What then may a parent reasonably expect a grammar school course in history to do for his children? Certainly not to correct oblique habits of thinking, or suggest set ways and means of getting along successfully in the world. Certainly not to make ready reference registers of them concerning dates, places, battles, names of reputable and disreputable persons, etc. No, a grammar school course in history should give them a bird's-eye view of American history, so arranged that the past will not seem insignificant and without importance, nor the present without its ideals, heroes, triumphs, problems and struggles.

Grammar school children should be given lessons in European as well as English history; but of both only so much as is necessary to make American history clear and comprehensible. All the history, European and American, that is taught grammar school children should awaken their curiosity, increase their knowledge in an elementary but definite way of the political and social mechanism of which they are a part, and instill into them sentiments of reverence, emulation and patriotism. Besides this, elementary history should be presented in such a way that no child, whatever its parentage, can have cause to infer or feel that the Almighty did not know his business when that child was born. And all the history that is taught should be conceived along lines that will teach and encourage the child to think like a citizen of the world, and always act like an American in and for the best interests of his country—America.

Lastly and most important of all, grammar school children should be taught that American history is largely the maturing and realization of social and political ideals; that statesmen and politicians, admirals and generals, are but instruments in the service of all the people, and that battles and controversies are but incidents and not the all in all or the whole thing in the history of the country and people; for the history of America is the history of all the people and their doings. All the people, from the Puritans and Pilgrims and the Cavaliers, down to all the mixed

races of the present day, have come here for social reasons of some sort. All of them came voluntarily; and they all came not for bread only, but to participate in a higher standard of life than was possible in the lands from which they voluntarily banished themselves. All of them felt their needs, and all of them prized their ideals. And is it not on these accounts that Americans are idealists and practical at the same time? And is it not on these accounts that Americans know how to appreciate the economic power of the almighty dollar, and yet make something more than a mere platitude of the phrase "All men are born free and equal"?

DISCUSSION

The discussion of these papers was then taken up by the following speakers:

Miss Mary B. Gillmore, Horace Mann School:—It is to be regretted that the committee should recommend for the grammar schools a history course which they justify chiefly on the ground of expediency. Moreover, the question may be fairly raised whether the reports that we have heard have succeeded in justifying the proposed course even on that ground.

The plan of limiting the history work in the last four years of the elementary school to the field of United States history offers a number of serious objections. Does United States history offer enough material appropriate for the grammar school to warrant the continuation of that subject through four consecutive years? Would not the impression of the continuity of the history of the United States be lost if it were divided into four periods with a year devoted to the study of each? Unless the teachers are very skilful, are not the children likely to become somewhat bored by such a long continued study of United States history? By the omission of ancient and medieval history from the course, would not the grammar schools be deprived of much historical material best suited to the children at that particular stage in their development? And above all, would not the general culture value of the history course in the grammar school be greatly lessened by limiting it to United States history? These are some of the questions that naturally arise on hearing the report of the committee.

Any reorganization of the history work in the elementary school, it seems to me, should begin at the top and work downward. In the seventh and eighth grades are to be found to-day the weakest spots in the present course of study. Here United States history has long been intrenched, and in consequence the influence of tradition is strongest. The traditional text-book determines for the teacher the topics that are to be taught, and as Doctor Sullivan has pointed out, there is but little differentiation in the content of elementary and high-school texts. Not till we have shaken ourselves free from the influence of tradition and are willing to be guided wholly in our selection of material by the children's interests and by our own knowledge of their experience in life, can we hope to work out a more rational history course for the grammar school. Most of the constitutional, political and financial history that is taught, or rather attempted, is entirely beyond the ken of the average boy and girl. Conditions have been made worse of late years by the unfortunate tendency to force college work down into the high school and high school work into the grades. We are often deceived into believing that the children understand much of the difficult matter that we give them by the fact that they can talk glibly on many subjects that they don't at all understand. Why not begin the reorganization of the entire history course in the elementary school by the elimination of unsuitable topics in the course in United States history at present used in the upper grammar grades? That accomplished, we shall find, I think, that all of the United States history that the children are prepared to receive can be taught in the last two years of the elementary school. This contraction of the course would make room in the fifth and sixth grades for topics selected from ancient and medieval history—fields especially rich in material interesting to boys and girls at that age.

The chief argument of the committee in justification of its plan seems to be that the average grammar school teacher is unprepared to teach any history other than that of the United States. Probably many grammar school teachers do know little more history than is contained in an elementary school history of the United States. But should the association propose a course with this class only in view, and would the course which

the committee proposes be much easier for the ignorant teacher to carry into effect than a course which included a wider field? The kind of material, I take it, which the committee suggests for fifth and sixth grades is not to be found in any elementary or high school text-book. In order to find it, the teacher will be obliged to do a very considerable amount of delving in the library. Moreover, has not Doctor Monroe in his report noted a growing tendency in the public schools toward the introduction of topics from ancient and medieval history? Would not this lead us to infer that the schools are already convinced of the value of such material, and that the teachers have already begun to widen their historical horizon?

Michael H. Lucey, Public School, No. 21, New York:—It is not enough to plan a good course of study in history. That is, comparatively speaking, an easy task. The difficult part of the work is in putting the course into execution. In large schools where there are many teachers, there is danger that the work will lack continuity. Too often teachers consider the work of their own grades as a unit and fail to see its relation to the general scheme. To prevent this one-sided view, frequent conferences should be held at which the work may be discussed.

The text-books used in our elementary schools are too difficult both in language and in style. They are much better fitted for high school pupils, and in fact some of our so-called elementary histories are used in high schools. When English history was introduced into our schools a short time ago, a well-known publishing house sent me an elementary English history. On examination I found it to be their high school history with a different cover and tag.

Now what is the consequence of putting such histories into the hands of our pupils? Each lesson becomes a language lesson. Each paragraph, often indeed, each sentence must be dissected in order to lay bare the meaning. This may be useful work, but it simply kills interest. A dislike for history is bred which prevents a pupil from doing any work in the subject after he has left school.

The thoughtful teacher will, of course, cast such books aside and use them only occasionally for reference. Oral work and

supplementary reading must then be resorted to. This does very well in the lower grades, but in our upper grammar grades it does not work so well. A certain definite amount of exact information is needed as a basis for further study, and the above method tends to create vague general impressions. What is wanted is a text-book so simple in subject matter, in language and in style that the ordinary child may read with understanding and with pleasure, and the contents of which he may master. With the solid foundation of fact thus prepared, anecdotes and stories will have greater value and interest when the pupil perceives that they are related to something already known.

In all our work the personality of the child should be kept in mind. Courses of study and books are made for the children, not children for books and courses of study. If the two do not fit it is a pretty safe presumption to say that the courses of study and the books should be pruned and twisted into shape rather than the children. And yet how often are the poor children made to suffer by trying to make them conform to certain barbarous molds prescribed by men.

BUSINESS MEETING

The treasurer made the following report of the finances for the fiscal year ending March 10, 1905:

Total Expenditures as per vouchers		$248.52
Total receipts:		
Bal. on hand March 10, 1904	$ 1.73	
Receipts from dues	151.00	152.73
Present deficit		$95.79
Dues from members		63.00
Deficit when all members have paid		$32.79

The auditing committee reported that it had examined the report of the treasurer and found the same correct. On motion the report of the committee was adopted.

For the council the secretary made a full report of its proceedings which may be summarized as follows:

A committee was appointed to prepare a list of aids for teachers, for publication in the minutes of 1906. The committee is composed of Professor W. I. Hull, chairman; Miss Elizabeth Briggs, Dr. F. B. Kelley, Miss Sarah A. Dynes, and Professor R. H. Wright.

The council unanimously recommends the adoption by the association of the following policy:

First, publishing a full account of the proceedings in the minutes, and supplying new members who join before January 1, 1906, with these minutes.

Second, making arrangements with at least two other history teachers' associations by which our members may be supplied with their minutes without extra cost to the members.

Third, authorizing the council to work out a plan by which local conferences shall be established and to execute the same.

The estimated expenses of carrying out this policy is $400.00, while the estimated income is $250.00. This deficit can be met in two ways, viz.: by increasing the membership by 150 or by raising the membership dues. The council unanimously recommends that the association pledge itself to securing 150 new

members. The large number of teachers in our section makes it not only possible but a comparatively easy task.

On motion this policy was adopted.

On motion the members of the association who shall be present at the meeting of the New England History Teachers' Association at Springfield shall be our accredited delegates.

The report of the Committee on Nominations was presented and adopted. The officers proposed by them were unanimously elected. The list is printed on page 2.

The Committee on Resolutions made the following report which was adopted:

March 11, 1905.

Your committee feels that the members of the association will agree with it in the statement that, this the third annual meeting of the association, has been the most enjoyable and the most successful in its history; that this success has been due not only to the zeal and energy of the members of the association, but also to the work of the local committee of arrangements and to the generosity of the authorities of New York University who have provided us with a place of meeting and the opportunity to assemble for social enjoyment.

The committee therefore recommends that the association vote its sincere thanks to each of the following:

First, to the Chancellor and the Corporation of New York University for the hospitality which they have extended to us during the formal meetings and which they are still to extend to us at the luncheon.

Second, to Professor M. S. Brown of the local committee for his tireless energy in arranging for the comfort and convenience of the members who have come from places outside of New York City, and especially for his thoughtfulness in providing us all with the opportunity of examining the latest and best books and apparatus which may be valuable to the teacher of history in his work.

Adjourned.

J. H. Van Sickle,
President.

E. H. Castle,
Secretary.

LIST OF MEMBERS

Abbe, Mrs. Robert,	City History Club,	New York City.
Abelson, Paul,	De Witt Clinton High School,	New York City.
Ames, Herman V.,	University of Pennsylvania,	Philadelphia Pa.
Anderson, Bingley,	The Misses Masters School,	Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.
Andrews, C. M.	Bryn Mawr College,	Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Andrews, Elizabeth A.,	Miss Baldwin's School,	Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Arnold, Isabel F.	Plainfield Seminary,	Plainfield, N. J.
Arthur, L. Louise,	Bryant High School,	Long Island City.
Avent, John,	Public School No. 83,	New York City.
Babcock, Earle B.,	Ethical Culture School,	New York City.
Baker, Oliver E.,	Columbia University,	New York City.
Balch, Elizabeth,	St. Agnes School,	Albany, N.Y.
Baldwin, Blanche,	High School for Girls,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Baldwin, Florence,	Miss Baldwin's School,	Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Baldwin, James F.,	Vassar College,	Poughkeepsie, N.Y.
Ballou, F. W.,	University of Cincinnati,	Cincinnati, O.
Banks, C. W. P.,	Public School No. 31,	Borough of Bronx.
Barnard, J. Lynn,	Ursinus College,	Collegeville, Pa.
Barret, Martha B.,	De Witt Clinton High School,	New York City.
Bates, A. B.,	Morris High School,	New York City.
Bates, F. G.,	Alfred University,	Alfred, N. Y.
Beard, C. A.,	Columbia University,	New York City
Beckwith, F. A.,	Wadleigh High School,	New York City
Belcher, Katharine F.,	Newark High School,	Newark, N. J.
Bergen, Kate A.,	High School,	Jamaica, N. Y.
Blydenburgh, J. E.,	Public School No. 102,	Brooklyn.
Bogardus, Helen M.,	Barnard School for Girls,	New York City.
Boynton, George E.,	Erasmus Hall High School,	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Brady, Tersa C.,	Public School No. 188,	New York City.
Brewer, Margaret H.,	Western District High School,	Washington, D. C.
Briggs, Elizabeth,	Dr. Sachs's School,	New York City.
Brooks, Helen F.,	Mt. Vernon School,	Camden, N. J.
Brown, Marshall S.,	New York University,	New York City.
Brownell, Jane L.,	Miss Baldwin's School,	Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Brush, W. F.		
Bryan, A. C.,	High School of Commerce,	Brooklyn.
Burnham, Smith,	State Normal School,	West Chester, Pa.
Burr, George L.,	Cornell University,	Ithaca, N. Y.
Butler, Arthur P.,	Morristown School,	Morristown, N. J.
Butler, Eliza R.,	Horace Mann School,	New York City.
Calhoun, Mary E.,	Horace Mann School,	New York City.
Campbell, Grace B.,	Private School,	New York City.

Campbell, James O.,	Westminster College,	New Wilmington, Pa.
Carhart, Elizabeth M.,	Brooklyn Heights Seminary,	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Carpenter, Leonora E.,	Eastern High School,	Baltimore, Md.
Carrell, Theodora M.,	Buffalo Seminary,	Buffalo, N. Y.
Carroll, Elizabeth H.,	Arundell School,	Baltimore, Md.
Carrs, Elizabeth,	Charlton School,	New York City.
Carter, Mary C.,	St. Timothy's School,	Catonsville, Md.
Carter, Sarah R.,	St. Timothy's School,	Catonsville, Md.
Cartwright, Otho G.,	Horace Mann School,	New York City.
Castle, Edward H.,	Teachers College,	New York City.
Chandler, J. A. C.,	Publisher,	New York City.
Chapin, Nelly A.,	St. Agatha School,	New York City.
Chapman, Lena M.,	High School,	Amsterdam, N. Y.
Chapman, Mildred B.,	High School,	Hammonton, N. J.
Chatfield, Hazen,	Public School 36,	New York City.
Chesley, Mabel,	Fulton High School,	Fulton, N. Y.
Cheyney, Edward P.,	University of Pennsylvania,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Clarke, Belle F.,	Normal School,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Coffin, Howard A.,	Publisher,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Colestock, Henry T.,	State Normal School,	Mansfield, Pa.
Collins, Maria C.,	Collegiate School for Girls,	Cincinnati, O.
Conant, O. P.,	Publisher,	New York City.
Condit, L. O.,	Riverview Academy,	Poughkeepsie, N.Y.
Conner, Frances S.,	High School,	Scranton, Pa.
Crawford, Mary V.,	Miss Baldwin's School,	Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Crosswell, James G.,	Brearley School,	New York City.
Crouse, F. B.,		Morristown, N. J.
Curtiss, Mrs. E. S.,	Normal School,	Geneseo, N. Y.
Davidson, Martha W.,		Chester, N. Y.
Davis, B. C.,	Alfred University,	Alfred, N. Y.
Davis, Esther V.,	Girls' Commercial High School,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Dawson, Edgar,	Delaware College,	Newark, Del.
Dean, Sarah M.,	Brearley School,	New York City.
Dodge, Dora B.,	Public School No. 55,	Brooklyn.
Dickson, Teney V.,		
Dubbs, Joseph H.,	Franklin and Marshall College,	Lancaster, Pa.
Duggan, S. P.,	City College,	New York City.
Dwyer, Elsie M.,	High School,	Montclair, N. J.
Dynes, Sarah A.,	State Normal School,	Trenton, N. J.
Edmonds, Franklin S.,	Central High School,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Ellery, Eloise,	Vassar College,	Poughkeepsie, N.Y.
Ensign, S. Laura,	Girls' Latin School,	Baltimore, Md.
Estvan, M.,	Dr. Sachs's School,	New York City.

Evans, Jessie C.,	High School for Girls,	Philadelphia, Pa
Ewing, Edith C.,	Charlton School,	New York City.
Fanning, Grace M. W.,	Manual Training High School,	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Fairchild, J. R.,	Publisher,	New York City.
Fairley, William,	High School of Commerce,	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Farrand, Anna A.,	High School,	Goshen, N. Y.
Farrand, Wilson,	Newark Academy,	Newark, N. J.
Fay, C. R.,	De Witt Clinton High School,	New York City.
Fay, Mary L.,	The Misses Kirk's School,	Rosemont, Pa.
Finley, J. H.,	City College,	New York City.
Foote, Anna E.,	State Normal School,	Jamaica, N. Y.
Freeland, M. Frances,	State Normal School,	Trenton, N. J.
Freeman, Minerva,	High School,	Dover, N. J.
Fuller, Alma A.,	Public School No. 89,	New York City.
Gallaher, Sarah M.,	Mountain Seminary,	Birmingham, Pa.
Gambrill, J. Montgomery,	Department of Education,	Annapolis, Md.
Gardiner, Frederick,	Yeats School,	Lancaster, Pa.
Gardner, Lizzie,	Public School No. 68,	New York City.
Gaskill, Lois S.,	Polytechnic Institute,	Brooklyn.
Gavit, Helen E.,	The Misses Ely's School,	New York City.
Geer, Clarence J.	Shady Side Academy,	Pittsburg, Pa.
Gerschanek, S.,	Harlem Preparatory School,	New York City.
Gilman, F. G.,	High School,	Newark, N. J.
Gilmore, Arthur S.,	High School,	Williamsport, Pa.
Girls' Department,	Friends' Central School,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Gminder, Albert J.,	Preparatory School,	Baltimore, Md.
Godfrey, Viola E.,	Girls' Commercial High School,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Goertner, Mrs. R.,	Girls' Technical High School,	New York City.
Goodwin, Emily A.,	Public School,	Brooklyn.
Goodwin, Ruth S.,	Friends' Select School,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Goodwin, W. G.,	Curtis High School,	New York City.
Guthrie, W. B.,	City College,	New York City.
Hadley, Sarah L.,	Vassar College,	Poughkeepsie, N.Y.
Haeseler, Louise H.,	High School for Girls,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Haight, S. C.,	City College,	New York City.
Hall, E. R.,	Balliol School,	Utica, N. Y.
Hall, Mary,	Manual Training High School,	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Hance, Isabel,	High School,	Dover, N. J.
Harjes, Helen G.,	Girls' High School,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Harn, Elmer,	Polytechnic Institute,	Baltimore, Md.
Harris, H. E.,	Public School No. 1,	Bayonne, N. J.

Hascall, T.,	High School,	Newark, N. J.
Haskins, Emily L.,	High School,	West Chester, Pa.
Hebden, Edwin,	Principal Group A, Public Schools,	Baltimore, Md.
Hedge, Louise J.,	Training School for Teachers,	Brooklyn.
Herrick, Cheesman A.,	Central High School,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Hess, William L.,	Lakewood School,	Lakewood, N. J.
Hewitt, C. L.,	High School,	Syracuse, N. Y.
Hill, Emilie B.,	Commercial High School for Girls,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Hodgdon, F. C.,	Publisher,	New York City.
Hogan, Katharine E.,	Public School 58,	New York City.
Holbrook, Dwight,	Military Academy,	Ossining, N. Y.
Horner, Blanche,	Public School No. 89,	New York City.
House, Lolabel,	Erasmus Hall High School,	Brooklyn.
Howe, S. B.,	High School,	Plainfield, N. J.
Howland, Arthur C.,	University of Pennsylvania,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Hughes, P. M.,	Director of High Schools,	Washington, D. C.
Hull, Charles H.,	Cornell University,	Ithaca, N. Y.
Hull, William I.,	Swarthmore College,	Swarthmore, Pa.
Hurley, Thomas L.,	Columbia College,	New York City.
Ives, Isabella,	Halsted School,	Yonkers, N. Y.
Jenkins, Mary S.,	High School,	Asbury Park, N. J.
Jennison, Lynn E.,	State Normal School,	Cortland, N. Y.
Jobe, Mary L.,	Miss Beard's School,	Orange, N. J.
Keagey, Esther,	De Witt Clinton High School,	New York City.
Kelley, Frank B.,	Public School No. 1,	Paterson, N. J.
Kelley, Mary J.,	Public School No. 184,	New York City.
Kenny, Josephine W.,	Swarthmore College,	Swarthmore, Pa.
Kilgore, Carrie B.,	Waynesburg College,	Waynesburg, Pa.
Kimball, Elizabeth G.,	High School,	Montclair, N. J.
Kingsbury, Lucie E.,	High School,	Montclair, N. J.
Knowlton, Daniel C.,	Newark Academy,	Newark, N. J.
Lamont, W. S.,	Pratt Institute,	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Langdon, William C.,	Keuka College,	Keuka Park, N. Y.
Larrabee, Hadley B.,	Collegiate Institute,	York, Pa.
Latané, Edith,	Emma Willard School,	Troy, N. Y.
Leach, Anna,	Utica Free Academy,	Utica, N. Y.
Leete, Gertrude,	Military Academy,	Peekskill, N. Y.
Leland, D. R.,	Randolph and Pond School,	New York City.
Lester, Carolina F.,	High School for Girls,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Lewis, Lucy,	University of Pennsylvania,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Lingelbach, W. E.,	Commercial High School,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Longstreth, Emma J.,	Woman's College,	Baltimore, Md.
Lord, Eleanor L.,		

Lowenstein, S. S.,	Public School No. 160,	New York City.
Luetscher, George D.,	George School,	George School, Pa.
Luqueer, F. L.,	Public School No. 126,	Brooklyn.
Lyon, Phœbus W.,	West Jersey Academy,	Bridgeton, N. J.
Lyon, Theodore E.,	Barnard School for Girls,	New York City.
Lyttle, Eugene W.,	Regent's Office,	Albany, N. Y.
Mace, William H.,	Syracuse University,	Syracuse, N. Y.
Mackenzie, James C.,	Mackenzie School,	Dobbs Ferry, N. Y.
Mackey, E.,	Superintendent Schools,	Trenton, N. J.
Mac Lear, Anne B.,	Columbia University,	New York City.
Madeira, Lucy,	High School,	Washington, D. C.
Mallette, Metta F.,	Centennial School,	Trenton, N. J.
Manning, Henrietta L.,	Kingston Academy,	Kingston, N. Y.
Mason, W. L.,	De Witt Clinton High School,	New York City.
Massinger, Elizabeth W.,	Girls' High School,	Philadelphia, Pa.
McAdam, Margaret C.,	Public School No. 129,	Brooklyn.
McCamant, Catharine,	Blair Presbyterial Academy,	Blairstown, N. J.
McClelland, Mary A.,	State Normal School,	Albany, N. Y.
McGuckin, W. G.,	City College,	New York City.
McLaughlin, Andrew C.,	Carnegie Institution,	Washington, D. C.
Mead, Nelson G.,	City College,	New York City.
Merriam, Betsey G.,	Girls' High School,	Brooklyn.
Miller, Frank H.,	De Witt Cliton High School,	New York City.
Miller, G. R.,	Superintendent of Schools,	Binghamton, N. Y.
Monroe, Paul,	Teachers College,	New York City.
Moore, Ellis W.,		Swarthmore, Pa.
Moore, J. H.,	City College,	New York City.
Moore, Mrs. K. A.,		Hoboken, N. J
Moore, T. R.,	City College,	New York City.
Morey, William C.,	University of Rochester,	Rochester, N. Y.
Morrey, W. T.,	Morris High School,	New York City.
Morrill, P. P.,	Miss Beard's School,	Orange, N. J.
Mullan, W. G. R.,	Georgetown College,	Washington, D. C.
Muzzey, D. S.,	Ethical Culture School,	New York City.
Myrick, Harriet C.,		Clinton, N. Y.
Newton, C. B.,	Lawrenceville Academy,	Lawrenceville, N. J.
North, F. R.,	Newark Academy,	Newark, N. J.
North, Mary,	High School,	Montclair, N. J.
North, Samuel M.,	Polytechnic Institute,	Baltimore, Md.
Noyes, Edmund S.,	High School,	Washington, D. C.
Nugent, William D.,	Publisher,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Nusbaum, Louis,	Central High School,	Philadelphia, Pa.
O'Brien, Katharine A.,	Public School No. 75,	New York City.
O'Connell, Eleanor C.,	Hughes High School,	Cincinnati, O.

Oliphant, C. J.,	Publisher,	New York City.
Osgood, Susan S.,	Central High School,	Binghamton, N. Y.
Paine, Frederick H.,	Eastern District High School,	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Patterson, B. F.,	Superintendent,	Pottsville, Pa.
Pearson, Henry C.,	Horace Mann School,	New York City.
Peck, J. A.,	Publisher,	New York City.
Peck, Paul F.,	State Normal School,	Bloomsburg, Pa.
Perkins, Clarence,	High School,	Bloomfield, N. J.
Perry, W. H.,	Lowville Academy,	Lowville, N. Y.
Pietsch, A. J.,	City College,	Baltimore, Md.
Potter, A. J.,	Publisher,	New York City.
Price, Blanche D.,	Commercial High School for Girls,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Puig, Louise M.,	Manual Training High School,	Brooklyn.
Rawson, Edward B.,	Friends' Seminary.	New York City.
Reisler, E.,	Polytechnic Institute,	Baltimore, Md.
Renningeo, Warren D.,	Perkiomen Seminary,	Pennsburg, Pa.
Rex, Percival T.,	Friends' Central School,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Ricker, Ella V.,	State Normal School,	Baltimore, Md.
Ripton, B. H.,	Union College,	Schenectady, N. Y.
Roberts, A.,	Lafayette College,	Easton, Pa.
Robinson, James H.,	Columbia University,	New York City.
Robinson, P. O.,	High School of Commerce,	New York City.
Rynearson, E.,	Director of High Schools,	Pittsburg, Pa.
Sachs, Julius,	Teachers College,	New York City.
Salmon, Lucy M.,	Vassar College,	Poughkeepsie, N.Y.
Sargeant, I. E.,	Public School No. 17,	Paterson, N. J.
Scales, C. L. G.,	State Normal School,	Oswego, N. Y.
Schuyler, Livingston R.,	College of the City of New York,	New York City.
Scott, Austin,	Rutgers College,	New Brunswick, N. J.
Scripture, Arthur M.,	High School,	New Hartford, N.Y.
Sebring, Emma G.,	St. Agatha School,	New York City.
Shenk, Hiram H.,	Lebanon Valley College,	Annville, Pa.
Shepherd, Fred S.,	Superintendent,	Asbury Park, N. J.
Sheppard, James J.,	High School of Commerce,	New York City.
Shipley, Hannah T.,	The Misses Shipley's School	Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Shotwell, James T.,	Columbia University,	New York City.
Sill, H. A.,	Cornell University,	Ithaca, N. Y.
Smith, A. W.,	High School of Commerce,	New York City.
Smith, E. E.,	High School,	Canajoharie, N. Y.
Smith, Frances A.,	Collegiate School,	Passaic, N. J.
Smith, William R.,	Bryn Mawr College,	Bryn Mawr, Pa.
Snider, G. E.,	City College,	New York City.

Spangler, Henry T.,	Ursinus College,	Collegeville, Pa.
Spaulding, Randall,	Superintendent,	Montclair, N. J.
Spayd, Henry H.,	Principal,	Minersville, Pa.
Speakman, Mrs. A. W.,	Friends' Central School,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Spencer, C. W.,	Colgate University,	Hamilton, N. Y.
Stamford, Helen,	Halsted School,	Yonkers, N. Y.
Stevens, Alice A.,	Girls' High School,	Brooklyn.
Stevens, Ellen Y.,	Brooklyn Heights Seminary,	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Stevens, Romiett,	Pratt Institute,	Brooklyn, N. Y.
Stevenson, E. L.,	Rutgers College,	New Brunswick, N. J.
Stewart, Mary,	Commercial High School for Girls,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Stryker, Florence E.,	National Park Seminary,	Forest Glen, Md.
Sullivan, James,	High School of Commerce,	New York City.
Sumner, Mary B.,	St. Timothy's School,	Catonsville, Md.
Sweeney, Margaret,	Berkley Institute,	Brooklyn.
Swetland, Roger W.,	Peddie Institute,	Hightstown, N. J.
Taylor, Jane I.,	Wadleigh High School,	New York City.
Taylor, James P.,	Colgate Academy,	Hamilton, N. Y.
Temple, Henry,	Washington and Jefferson College,	Washington, Pa.
Tildsley, J. L.,	High School of Commerce,	New York City.
Thomas, A. C.,	Haverford College,	Haverford, Pa.
Thompson, Annie S.,	High School,	Flushing, N. Y.
Thompson, Clara M.,	Wilford High School,	Baltimore, Md.
Thompson, Frederick L.,	Dr. Sachs's School,	New York City.
Thompson, H.,	City College,	New York City.
Thompson, W. P.,	Superintendent,	Ardmore, Pa.
Thorp, Anna F. M.,	High School,	Paterson, N. J.
Todd, J. R.,	City College,	New York City.
Tolson, William H.,	Principal,	Baltimore, Md.
Tracy, Charles A.,	Military Institute,	Bordentown, N. J.
Trask, T. C.,	High School of Commerce,	New York City.
Travis, A. Lincoln,	Classical School,	Syracuse, N. Y.
Umsted, Mary G.,	Commercial High School for Girls,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Van Dyke, Paul,	Princeton University,	Princeton, N. J.
Van Sickle, J. H.,	Superintendent,	Baltimore, Md.
Ver Planck, Judith C.,	High School,	Yonkers, N. Y.
Very, Edith,	Brearley School,	New York City.
Vincent, J. M.,	Johns Hopkins University,	Baltimore, Md.
Walker, Amasa,	Publisher,	New York City.
Walker, Mrs. B.,	Columbia University,	New York City.
Waln, Emma,	Friends' School,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Warfield, E. D.,	Lafayette College,	Easton, Pa.

Ware, Moses W.,	Morristown School,	Morristown, N. J.
Welch, Fannie F.,	High School,	Passaic, N. J.
Whitson, Hannah,	High School,	Swarthmore, Pa.
Wickes, W. K.,	High School,	Syracuse, N. Y.
Williams, Florence,	High School,	Chester, Pa.
Willis, Henry,	Central High School,	Philadelphia, Pa.
Wilson, James F.,	Stuyvesant High School,	New York City.
Wise, Frank,	Publisher,	New York City.
Wolfson, Arthur M.,	De Witt Clinton High School,	New York City.
Wood, Elizabeth C.,	Wadleigh High School,	New York City.
Wood, Nellie A.,	Kingston Academy,	Kingston, N. Y.
Woodman, Anna S.,	Kent Place,	Summit, N. J.
Wright, Mary E.,	Kent Place,	Summit, N. J.
Wright, R. H.,	City College,	Baltimore, Md.
Yarrington, A.,	Manual Training High School,	Brooklyn.
Young, Ella,	Halsted School,	Yonkers, N. Y.

Members are requested to notify the Secretary of changes or corrections in addresses or omissions.